CHAEREMON

EGYPTIAN PRIEST AND STOIC PHILOSOPHER

ÉTUDES PRÉLIMINAIRES AUX RELIGIONS ORIENTALES DANS L'EMPIRE ROMAIN

PUBLIÉES PAR

M.J. VERMASEREN†
M.E.C. VERMASEREN-VAN HAAREN ET MARGREET B. DE BOER

TOME CENT-UNIÈME

PIETER WILLEM VAN DER HORST

CHAEREMON

EGYPTIAN PRIEST AND STOIC PHILOSOPHER

CHAEREMON

EGYPTIAN PRIEST AND STOIC PHILOSOPHER

The fragments collected and translated with explanatory notes

BY

PIETER WILLEM VAN DER HORST

E. J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1987

First Impression: 1984

Photomechanical Reprint
with a Preface and Addenda et Corrigenda

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Chaeremon, of Alexandria.
Chaeremon, Egyptian priest and stoic philiosopher.

(Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain; t. 101)
English, Greek, and Latin.
Reprint. Originally published: Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984. With additions and corrections.
Bibliography: p.
Includes indexes.
1. Egypt—Religion. 2. Stoics. 3. Astrology, Egyptian. I. Horst, Pieter Willem van der.
II. Title. III. Series.
BL2440.C46 1987 188 87-14700
ISBN 90-04-08501-7 (pbk.)

ISSN 0531-1950
ISBN 90 04 08501 7

Copyright 1984 and 1987 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS BY E.J. BRILL

For
Mirjam and Bernardine

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface to the second edition VIII
Introduction IX
Conspectus fragmentorum XV
Table of Abbreviations XVII
Select Bibliography XIX

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Testimonia 2
Fragmenta 8
Fragmenta certa 8
Fragmenta dubia 26

Notes to the Testimonia 47
Notes to the Fragments 49

Index of Subjects and Names 75

Index of Ancient Authors and Works 79

Addenda et Corrigenda to the first edition 81

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The first edition of this book was sold out within three years. The author is grateful to Dr. W. Backhuys, president of E. J. Brill, for his request to prepare a second edition. For several reasons the following procedure was adopted. The text of the first edition has been reprinted unaltered, but at those places in the text where modifications or additions seemed necessary, an asterisk has been printed in the margin to refer the reader to the *Addenda et corrigenda* on pp. 81-83. In the addenda there are also references to the page and line (or note) which required correction or amplification. I wish to express my thanks to the reviewers and colleagues who drew my attention to some omissions or questioned some of my original assumptions.

Utrecht, April 1987 P.W.v.d.H.

INTRODUCTION

The Man and his Work[1]

Chaeremon lived in the first century of the Common Era. The exact dates of his birth and death are unknown, but there is evidence that enables us to place his active career in the middle of the first Christian century. The *Suda* tells us that he was a teacher of the young Nero[2], probably before Seneca assumed that function in 49 C.E. According to the *Suda* he had also been head of the Alexandrian school of grammarians[3] (and perhaps also keeper of the famous Museum in Alexandria)[4], probably before he was called to Rome to become Nero's teacher, since it was certainly on the basis of his fame as an Alexandrian scholar that he was invited to the Roman court[5]. Since it is probable that he was one of the Alexandrian ambassadors to the Emperor Claudius in 40 C.E.[6], he presumably was already a well-known scholar before that date. And since it is possible that one of his works was written after 54 or 60 C.E.[7], most probably his literary activities were taking place between about 30 and 65 C.E. As Schwyzer has argued, Chaeremon must have died a considerable time before 96 C.E., the year of publication of Martial's eleventh book of *Epigrams*. In XI 56 Chaeremon is derided, and Martial usually did not mock persons who were still living or had only recently died[8].

It is impossible that our Chaeremon was identical with the Chaeremon (mentioned by Strabo XVII 806) who accompanied Aelius Gallus during his trip on the Nile in 23 B.C.E.[9]. It should be borne in mind that Chaeremon was a very common name in antiquity, especially in Egypt[10].

Unfortunately, all Chaeremon's works have been lost; therefore later authors from the first to the twelfth century are our only source of information. Titles mentioned by later authors who quote from these works are : Αἰγυπτιακὴ ἱστορία, Ἱερογλυφικά, Περὶ κομητῶν[11]. Whether the fragments we have on Egyptian religion and the way of life of the Egyptian priests (fragm. 2, 4, 5, 10) belonged to his *History of Egypt* or to another writing can no longer be ascertained. In addition, Chaeremon must have written a grammatical treatise, the title of which is lost, from which our fragm. 14 derives[12].

In the ancient sources, Chaeremon is called Στωϊκός (or φιλόσοφος) and ἱερογραμματεύς (sacred scribe). That Chaeremon was a Stoic philosopher is clear from his interpretation of Egyptian deities and myths. In fragm. 5 (cf. fragm. 6 through 9) he explains in a typically Stoic way the tales about these gods and goddesses as referring to sun, moon, planets, and other heavenly bodies, to the Nile, καὶ ὅλως πάντα εἰς τὰ φυσικά, "and in general

everything as referring to physical things". And in fragm. 12, again in a Stoic way, he explains hieroglyphs as the symbols by which the ancient scribes concealed their φυσικὸς λόγος περὶ θεῶν, "physical theory about the gods"[13].

* In Stoic philosophy, theology was part of physics!

The *hierogrammateis* to which Chaeremon is said to have belonged formed the scholarly class of priests in the hierarchy in the Egyptian temples. They had several functions among which were the finding of sacred animals, the testing of candidates for priesthood, the interpretation of dreams, foretelling the future, and especially cultivating the knowledge of the ancient Egyptian scripts[14]. This last-mentioned function explains the fact that Chaeremon wrote a book on hieroglyphs which became very influential in late antiquity. It is most probable that authors like Clement of Alexandria and Horapollo drew upon it, and it is certain that the Byzantine polymath Johannes Tzetzes

* still did so in the twelfth century (see Test. 6 and fragm. 12)[15].

The longest and most interesting fragment (fragm. 10) preserved shows that Chaeremon shares the typically Hellenic, and especially Hellenistic tendency to extol Egyptian traditions and wisdom[16]. This fragment has been preserved (together with some others) by Porphyry, the third century Neoplatonist philosopher, and this is only one of the many signs of the ever growing interest of Neoplatonists in Egypt (cf. e.g. Iamblichus' treatise *On the Egyptian Mysteries*)[17]. Here Chaeremon's inclination to idealize the way of life of the Egyptian priests is manifest and he clearly superimposes Hellenistic ideals upon an Egyptian situation[18]. The priests are described as ascetic philosophers, living in temples, continually occupied with purifications and fasts and other kinds of abstinence, almost inaccessible to the common people, and wholly dedicated to contemplation of the divine world and to the study of all kinds of sciences, especially the science of the heavenly bodies and their movements. Their strict and frugal way of life made them very revered among the people. This picture has several parallels in Hellenistic literature[19]. Although partly based on actual data, it is one more example of a well-known literary genre in late antiquity, the idealized description of priestly castes or religious fraternities among barbarian (= non-Greek) peoples[20].

Like so many hellenized Egyptians in Ptolemaic and Roman Alexandria, Chaeremon was an anti-Semite. Fragm. 1, excerpted from his *History of Egypt* shortly after his death by Josephus, renders his version of the Exodus story in which he depicts the Jewish people as a group of sick and maimed outcasts who were expelled from Egypt because Isis commanded the king to do so. We have some ten such anti-Semitic accounts of the Exodus by authors from the Hellenistic and Roman period, often only preserved in Josephus' quotations in *Contra Apionem*[21]. It should be borne in mind that in Chaeremon's time there were very strong tensions between Greeks and

Jews in Alexandria and that due to these tensions embassies were sent to the Roman emperor in 40 C.E., the Greek one headed by the notorious anti-Semitic author Apion, and the Jewish one by Philo. Must probably Chaeremon was a member of the Greek delegation (see Test. 5)[22].

Chaeremon's ideas are an interesting syncretistic mixture of Egyptian religious ideas, Stoic philosophic concepts, magical and astrological interests, and anti-Semitic sentiments. He is important to the students of the environment and background of the early Church as one of those who strove after an amalgamation of Egyptian and Greek concepts, and as such he gives valuable insight into the world of a syncretistic, intellectual élite in the time of the first generations of Christianity.

The Present Edition

Previous editions of Chaeremon's fragments are by C. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum* III, Paris (Didot) 1849, 495-499 (text and Latin translation); by F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* III C 1, Leiden (Brill) 1958, 145-153 (text only); and by H.R. Schwyzer, *Chairemon* (Klassisch-philologische Studien 4), Leipzig (Harrassowitz) 1932 (text and commentary). Schwyzer's edition is by far the most useful of the three but has some drawbacks which make a new edition, after fifty years, desirable. First, although the Greek of the fragments is often hard to understand, the Greek text is presented without translation. Second, in its time Schwyzer's edition was based upon the most recent critical editions of the authors who quote the fragments, but in the interval several of these editions have been superseded by better ones (e.g. Mras' edition of Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* in 1954/56, Sodano's edition of Porphyry's *Letter to Anebo* in 1958, Sbordone's edition of Horapollo's *Hieroglyphica* in 1940). Third, the commentary, excellent as it was fifty years ago, needs revision in several respects, e.g. regarding matters of Egyptology[23]. Fourth, Schwyzer prints his *fragmenta certa* and his *fragmenta dubia* side by side, e.g. nos. 1 and 2 are *certa*, 2a is *dubium*, 3 through 5 are *certa*, 6 through 9 are *dubia*, 10 is *certum*, 11 and 12 are *dubia*, etc. I think that it is much more conducive to a clear appraisal of the author's ideas to separate the *fragmenta certa* from the *dubia*, and to give them a separate numbering. I have numbered the undoubtedly authentic fragments (i.e. those which are explicitly quoted as being from Chaeremon) as nos. 1 to 14, and the fragments of dubious authenticity (where Chaeremon's name is not mentioned) as nos. 15D-28D. Confusing though it may be to introduce a new numbering of an author's fragments, the need seemed compelling. The conspectus at the end of the Introduction will show the different numberings in a synoptic table. That I have 28 fragments, whereas Schwyzer has 18, is due to three facts: a) I promoted

to the status of fragment some texts which are quoted by Schwyzer only in the apparatus (my nos. 8, 9 and 11); b) I have given individual numbers to individual quotations by one author which Schwyzer often combined under one number; c) I have added some new *fragmenta dubia* (16D, 20D, 27D, 28D)[24]. I also added three new *testimonia* (nos. 10, 11 and 12).

As there are good critical editions available of almost all authors who quote Chaeremon, I have not presented a critical apparatus of the texts. Text-critical matters are discussed (in the notes) only when I disagree with the editors whose editions I use or when variant readings have important implications for the exegesis of the passage concerned.

The translations are my own, although in some cases I rely heavily upon existing translations. The notes to the translation are not intended to constitute a full commentary on Chaeremon. Rather their purpose is three-fold: to elucidate difficult points in the fragments, to adduce ancient parallels which could illustrate the various traditions available to Chaeremon, and to refer the reader to standard works in which he may find fuller discussion of the points raised in the notes.

An intractable problem is the task of deciding whether or not a fragment which is not specifically attributed to Chaeremon should be attributed to him[25]. In fact, the *fragmenta dubia* vary from fragments which almost certainly derive from Chaeremon to fragments which almost certainly do not. Great caution and reserve should be excercised here. Some of these *dubia* — which I think can hardly be from Chaeremon's pen — have been printed in this edition simply because they are in Schwyzer's and in order to enable the reader to decide for himself whether they can reasonably be attributed to our author or not. Others have been added because scholars since Schwyzer have more or less convincingly argued that they may derive from Chaeremon. I cannot, however, agree with Jean Hani that whole passages in Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride* go back to Chaeremon[26]. The evidence he adduces for that viewpoint is definitely too slender. But certainty in matters like these is hardly to be attained[27].

The author wishes to express his deep gratitude to Dr. G. Mussies and Prof. A.H.M. Kessels for their assistence in his attempts to elicit meaning from the sometimes obscure Greek. I am very grateful to Prof. H. te Velde and especially to Prof. J. Gwyn Griffiths for their generous help in Egyptological matters. Without their many advices this book would never have become what it is now. I am also indebted to Dr. H.-R. Schwyzer who, after half a century, was willing to return to the subject of his dissertation, read through the whole manuscript, and send me a wealth of most valuable suggestions. Finally, I also thank Dr. W.L. Petersen and Prof. H.-D. Betz for their revision of the English and their stimulating criticisms, Liesbeth

Daniels for typing parts of the manuscript, and Prof. M.J. Vermaseren for accepting the book for the EPRO series.

University of Utrecht, January 1983 P.W. VAN DER HORST

NOTES

1 See H.-R. Schwyzer, *Chairemon* (Klassisch-philologische Studien 4), Leipzig (Harassowitz) 1932, 9-16.
2 See Test. 3.
3 See Test. 4.
4 See note 3 to Test. 4.
5 E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* III 1, Hildesheim (Olms) 1963[6] (repr. of the 1923[5] ed.), 712 assumes that Chaeremon became head of a school in Alexandria *after* having been Nero's teacher, which is not impossible.
6 See Test. 5 with note 1.
7 See note 2 to fragm. 3.
8 Schwyzer, *Chairemon* 9.
9 Schwyzer, *Chairemon* 10, against C. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum* III, Paris (Didot) 1849, 495.
10 See the frequency of this name in W. Peremans and E. van 't Dack, *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*, 6 vols. (Studia Hellenistica 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 17), Louvain (Publications Universitaires) 1950-1968, nos. 613, 959, 1118, 1282, 1283, 1317, 1744, 1817, 2431, 2561, 2708, 2709, 2710, 3618, 4133, and often. See also F. Preisigke, *Namenwörterbuch*, Heidelberg (Selbstverlag) 1922, 470, and D. Foraboschi, *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum. Supplemento al Namenbuch di F. Preisigke*, Milano (Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino) 1971, 338.
11 See Test. 1, 2, and 6 and fragm. 1, 3, 12, and 13.
12 It is not probable that this fragment is from another Chaeremon because of the fact that the quotation is said to be from Chaeremon the Stoic philosopher. That historians and philosophers wrote on grammatical problems was not an uncommon phenomenon in antiquity; see W. von Christ-W. Schmid-O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* II 1, München (Beck) 1920[6], 383.
13 See E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen* (n. 5) III 1, 712. Zeller also posits that Chaeremon's favourable explanation of comets is a Stoic trait, but it is not only Stoic; see W. Gundel, Kometen, *RE* XI (1922) 1149f.
14 See K.Th. Zauzich, Hierogrammat, *LdÄ* II (1977), 119-1201, and note 58 to fragm. 10.
15 See my article 'The Secret Hieroglyphs in Classical Literature', in J. den Boeft – A.H.M. Kessels (edd.), *Actus. Studies in Honour of H.L.W. Nelson*, Utrecht (Instituut voor Klassieke Talen) 1982, 115-123.
16 It is a striking parallel (although only one among many) to what his younger contemporary Luke says about Moses' education in πᾶσα σοφία Αἰγυπτίων (Acts VII 22).
17 See E. Iversen, *The Myth of Egypt and its Hieroglyphs in European Tradition*, Copenhagen (Gad) 1961, 45ff., and especially his article 'The Hieroglyphic Tradition', in J.R. Harris (ed.), *The Legacy of Egypt*, Oxford (Clarendon Press) 1971[2], 175ff.
18 See note 1 to fragm. 10 and my article 'The Way of Life of the Egyptian Priests according to Chaeremon', in M. Heerma van Voss *et alii* (edd.), *Studies in Egyptian Religion Dedicated to Professor Jan Zandee*, Leiden (Brill) 1982, 61-71.
19 See H. Strathmann, Chairemon, *RAC* II (1954) 991 and the notes to fragm. 10; also Schwyzer, *Chairemon* 78ff.
20 See A.-J. Festugière in *REG* 50 (1937), 476.
21 See note 1 to fragm. 1.

22 For details of this matter see E.M. Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, Leiden (Brill) 1970², 24-31, and also her *The Jews under Roman Rule*, Leiden (Brill) 1976, 242ff.

23 As I am not an Egyptologist myself, I had to rely upon competent colleagues.

24 Schwyzer's *fragmentum dubium* 18 has been omitted in the present edition. Schwyzer prints there only a French translation (by G. Botti in 1897) of a now lost Coptic manuscript containing a description of the tomb of Alexander the Great, supposedly written by a certain Khademon. It has no relation whatsoever with the other fragments of Chaeremon and certainly has nothing to do with our author (as Schwyzer himself admits in a letter of August 13, 1980).

25 As is well-known, an identical problem is met with in the case of Posidonius (and other authors, of course).

26 J. Hani, *La religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque*, Paris (Les Belles Lettres) 1976, 20f. and elsewhere (see his index). J. Gwyn Griffiths, in his extensive survey of Plutarch's sources in his *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride*, Cardiff (Wales University Press) 1970, 75-100, rightly nowhere mentions Chaeremon, in spite of some points of contact between these two authors.

27 The arguments for attributing the *fragmenta dubia* to Chaeremon are presented each time in the first footnote to the fragment.

CONSPECTUS

This edition		Schwyzer's edition
	certa	
Fragm.	1	Fragm. 1
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4
	5	5
	6	5a
	7	5b
	8	in Schw.'s apparatus *ad* fragm. 5
	9	in Schw.'s apparatus *ad* fragm. 5
	10	10
	11	in Schw.'s apparatus *ad* fragm. 10
	12	13
	13	16
	14	17
	dubia	
	15 D	2a
	16 D	—
	17 D	6
	18 D	7
	19 D	8
	20 D	—
	21 D	9
	22 D	11
	23 D	12a
	24 D	12b
	25 D	14
	26 D	15
	27 D	—
	28 D	—
	—	18

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

BCH	Bulletin de correspondence hellénique
BIFAO	Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
CPJ	Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum
EPRO	Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
LdÄ	Lexikon der Ägyptologie
LSJ	H.G. Liddell-R. Scott-H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1940[9]
OMRO	Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum voor Oudheden te Leiden
P. Oxy.	Oxyrhynchus Papyri
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum
RE	Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft
REG	Revue des études grecques
RGVV	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeite
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik
ZRGG	Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS ON CHAEREMON

S. Birch, 'On the Lost Book of Chaeremon on Hieroglyphics', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, 2nd series, vol. 3 (1850), 385-396.

E. Zeller, 'Die Hieroglyphiker Chäremon und Horapollo', *Hermes* 11 (1876), 430-433.

O. Gruppe, *Die griechischen Culte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den orientalischen Religionen*, Leipzig (Teubner) 1887, I 433-439.

E. Schwartz, 'Chairemon', *RE* III (1899), 2025-2027.

S. Krauss, 'Chaeremon', *Jewish Encyclopedia* III (1902), 658-659.

E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* III, Leipzig (Teubner) 1909⁴, 536-538.

H.-R. Schwyzer, *Chairemon* (Klassisch-philologische Studien 4), Leipzig (Harassowitz) 1932.

C. Wendel, 'Zum Hieroglyphenbuche Chairemons', *Hermes* 75 (1940), 227-229.

F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* III C 1, Leiden (Brill) 1958, 145-153.

H. Strathmann, 'Chairemon', *RAC* II (1959), 990-992.

E. Iversen, *The Myth of Egypt and its Hieroglyphs in European Tradition*, Copenhagen (Gad) 1961, 46-47.

L. Roth, 'Chaeremon', *Encyclopaedia Judaica* V (1971), 317-318.

P.W. van der Horst, 'Chaeremon, Egyptisch priester en antisemitisch Stoïcijn uit de tijd van het Nieuwe Testament', *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 35 (1981), 265-272.

P.W. van der Horst, 'The Way of Life of the Egyptian Priests according to Chaeremon', in M. Heerma van Voss *et alii* (edd.), *Studies in Egyptian Religion Dedicated to Prof. Jan Zandee*, Leiden (Brill) 1982; 61-71. *

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

TESTIMONIA

Test. 1: Suda *s.v.* Χαιρήμων (ed. A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* IV, Stuttgart (Teubner) 1935, repr. 1971, p. 794)

Χαιρήμων, κωμικός. ... καὶ ἕτερος Χαιρήμων, γράψας Ἱερογλυφικά.

Test. 2: Suda *s.v.* Ἱερογλυφικά (II, 1931, repr. 1967, p. 615 ed. Adler)

Ἱερογλυφικὰ ἔγραψεν ὁ Χαιρήμων.

Test. 3: Suda *s.v.* Ἀλέξανδρος Αἰγαῖος (I, 1928, repr. 1971, p. 104 ed. Adler)

Ἀλέξανδρος Αἰγαῖος· φιλόσοφος Περιπατητικός, διδάσκαλος Νέρωνος τοῦ βασιλέως, ἅμα Χαιρήμονι τῷ φιλοσόφῳ.

Test 4: Suda *s.v.* Διονύσιος Ἀλεξανδρεύς (II, pp. 109-110 ed. Adler)

Διονύσιος Ἀλεξανδρεύς, ὁ Γλαύκου υἱός, γραμματικός· ὅστις ἀπὸ Νέρωνος συνῆν καὶ τοῖς μέχρι Τραιανοῦ καὶ τῶν βιβλιοθηκῶν προῦστη καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν καὶ πρεσβειῶν ἐγένετο καὶ ἀποκριμάτων. ἦν δὲ καὶ διδάσκαλος Παρθενίου τοῦ γραμματικοῦ, μαθητὴς δὲ Χαιρήμονος τοῦ φιλοσόφου, ὃν καὶ διεδέξατο ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ.

Test. 5: Epistula Claudii Imperatoris ad Alexandrinos (V. A. Tcherikover - A. Fuks (edd.), *Corpus Papyrorum Iudaicarum* II, Cambridge, Mass. (Harvard University Press) 1960, p. 39, nr. 153, 14-21)

Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Βάρβιλλος, Ἀπολλώνις Ἀπτεμιδώρου, Χαιρήμων Λεωνίδου, ..., ὑ(= οἱ) πρέσβεις ὑμῶν ἀναδόντες μοι τὸ ψήφισμα πολλὰ περὶ τῆς πόλεως διεξῆλθον.

Test. 6: Scholion of Tzetzes on the *Iliad* (L. Bachmann, *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem* I, Leipzig (Kollmann) - London (Black, Young & Young) 1835, p. 838; also in G. L. Calabro, De Ioannis Tzetzae studiis Homericis, *Bolletino del Comitato per la preparazione dei classici greci e latini* N.S. 12 (1964), 71)

περὶ τῶν Αἰθιοπικῶν γραμμάτων Διόδωρος μὲν ἐπεμνήσθη καὶ μερικῶς εἶπεν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀκοῆς ἄλλου μαθὼν καὶ οὐκ ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸς ἐπιστάμενος, ... Χαιρήμων δὲ ὁ ἱερογραμματεὺς ὅλην βίβλον περὶ τῶν τοιούτων γραμμάτων συνέταξεν, ἅτινα ἐν τοῖς προσφόροις τόποις τῶν Ὁμηρείων ἐπῶν ἀκριβέστερον καὶ πλατυτέρως ἐρῶ.

Test. 7: Josephus, *Contra Apionem* II 1 (ed. B. Niese, *Flavii Josephi Opera*, vol. V, Berlin (Weidmann) 1955², p. 54)

διὰ μὲν οὖν τοῦ προτέρου βιβλίου ... τήν τε ἀντίρρησιν ἐποιησάμην πρὸς Μανεθὼν καὶ Χαιρήμονα καί τινας ἑτέρους.

TESTIMONIA

Test. 1: Suda *s.v.* Chaeremon

Chaeremon, a comic poet. ... There was also another Chaeremon, who wrote a *Hieroglyphica.*

Test. 2: Suda *s.v.* Hieroglyphica

Chaeremon wrote a *Hieroglyphica.*

Test. 3: Suda *s.v.* Alexander the Aegaean

Alexander the Aegaean, a Peripatetic philosopher, teacher of the emperor Nero together with the philosopher Chaeremon.

Test. 4: Suda *s.v.* Dionysius of Alexandria

Dionysius of Alexandria, the son of Glaucus, a philologist. He lived from the time of Nero to the time of Trajan[1] and was the director of the libraries and had the offices of *ab epistulis*, *a legationibus*, and *a responsis*[2]. He was also the teacher of the philologist Parthenius, and he was a pupil of Chaeremon the philosopher, whom he had also succeeded in Alexandria[3].

Test. 5: *Letter of the emperor Claudius to the Alexandrians* 14-21

Tiberius Claudius Barbillus, Apolloni(u)s son of Artemidorus, Chaeremon son of Leonidas, ... [many other names] ..., your ambassadors, presented me with the decree and spoke at length about the city[1].

Test. 6: Tzetzes, Scholion on the *Iliad*

Diodorus made mention of the Ethiopic characters[1], and he spoke in detail about them, but in the manner of one who had learned about them only by hearsay from another, without having an exact knowledge of them himself[2]. ... Chaeremon, however, the sacred scribe, wrote a whole book about such characters. On these I will speak more precisely and elaborately at the relevant passages of the Homeric poems[3].

Test. 7: Josephus, *Contra Apionem* II 1

In the previous book ... I also refuted the statements of Manetho, Chaeremon, and some others[1].

Test. 8: Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana* XII 4 (ed. W. Wolska - Conus, vol. III, Sources Chrétiennes 197, Paris (Du Cerf) 1973, p. 365-7)

οἱ δὲ τὰ Αἰγυπτιακὰ συγγραψάμενοι, τουτέστι Μανεθὼν καὶ Χαιρήμων καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων καὶ Λυσίμαχος καὶ Ἀπίων ὁ γραμματικός, μέμνηνται Μωϋσέως καὶ τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ τῆς Αἰγύπτου. ὡς Αἰγύπτιοι γὰρ καὶ Αἰγυπτιακὰ ἀναγραφόμενοι ἁρμοδίως καὶ αὐτοὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων γενόμενα διηγοῦνται, οἵτινες καὶ διασύρουσι Μωϋσέα ὡς στασιάσαντα καὶ πλῆθος τῶν ἀγυρτῶν καὶ λελωβημένων ἀναστατώσαντα καὶ ἐκβαλόντα τῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἀπελθόντας εἰς τὸ Σίναιον ὄρος καὶ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ κληθέντας Ἰουδαίους.

Test. 9: Porphyry, *Contra Christianos* fragm. 39 Harnack (= Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VI 19, 8, ed. G. Bardy, vol. II, Sources Chrétiennes 41, Paris (Du Cerf) 1955, p. 115)

ἐχρῆτο δὲ καὶ Χαιρήμονος τοῦ Στωϊκοῦ Κορνούτου τε ταῖς βίβλοις, παρ' ὧν τὸν μεταληπτικὸν τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησιν μυστηρίων γνοὺς τρόπον ταῖς Ἰουδαϊκαῖς προσῆψεν γραφαῖς.

Test. 10: Martial, *Epigram* XI 56 (ed. W.C.A. Ker, Loeb Classical Library, London (Heinemann) - Cambridge, Mass. (Harvard University Press) 1920, p. 278)

Quod nimium mortem, Chaeremon Stoice, laudas,
vis animum mirer suspiciamque tuum?
hanc tibi virtutem fracta facit urceus ansa,
et tristis nullo qui tepet igne focus,
et teges et cimex et nudi sponda grabati,
et brevis atque eadem nocte dieque toga.
o quam magnus homo es qui faece rubentis aceti
et stipula et nigro pane carere potes!
Leuconicis agedum tumeat tibi culcita lanis
constringatque tuos purpura pexa toros,
dormiat et tecum modo qui dum Caecuba miscet
convivas roseo torserat ore puer:
o quam tu cupies ter vivere Nestoris annos
et nihil ex ulla perdere luce voles!
rebus in angustis facile est contemnere vitam:
fortiter ille facit qui miser esse potest.

Test. 11: Galen, *Commentarii in Hippocratis De victu acutorum* I 15 (144) (edd. J. Mewaldt - G. Helmreich - J. Westenberger, *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* V 9, 1, Leipzig (Teubner) 1915, p. 129, 31-33)

ἐδείκνυε δὲ καὶ τὰς Πόλλητος καὶ Ἀθηναίου καὶ Χαιρήμονος καὶ Ἀρτε-

Test. 8: Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana* XII 4

Those who wrote histories of Egypt, namely Manetho, Chaeremon, Apollonius Molon, Lysimachus, and Apion the philologist, make mention of Moses and the exodus of the sons of Israel from Egypt. For as Egyptians and writers about Egyptian history, they too, fittingly, relate the events that happened in their regions, but they also disparage Moses as one who provoked a sedition and who stirred up a mass of beggars and lepers and led them out of Egypt; and (they say) that once they had left for mount Sinai and Jerusalem, they called themselves Jews[1].

Test. 9: Porphyry, *Contra Christianos* fragm. 39

He (*sc.* Origen) also made use of the books of Chaeremon the Stoic and of Cornutus; from these he learned the allegorical method of interpreting the mysteries of the Greeks, and he applied it to the Jewish scriptures[1].

Test. 10: Martial, *Epigram* XI 56[1]

Because you, Stoic Chaeremon, praise death too much,
do you want me to admire and esteem your spirit?
A jug with a broken handle creates this virtue for you,
and a sullen hearth warmed by no fire,
and a mat, bugs, a framework of a bare cot,
and the same short toga for night and day alike.
Oh, how great a man you are, who can do without
the dregs of cheap red wine and straw and black bread!
Come, let your pillow swell with Leuconian wool,
and let woolly purple enwrap your couch,
and let the boy sleep with you who, while he mixes
the Caecuban wine, tortures your guests with his rosy mouth!
Oh, how you will long to live Nestor's life-span three times,
and want to lose nothing of any day!
In poverty it is easy to despise life;
that man only shows a strong character who knows how to be wretched.

Test. 11: Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' De victu acutorum* I 15[1]

He (*sc.* a Greek augur from Asia Minor) demonstrated that the books

μιδώρου τοῦ Φωκᾶ ἄλλων τέ τινων οἰωνιστῶν ἐνδόξων βίβλους αὐτῷ συμμαρτυρούσας.

Test. 12 : Tzetzes, *Exegesis in Iliadem* I 193 (ed. A. Lolos, *Der unbekannte Teil der Ilias-Exegesis des Iohannes Tzetzes*, Königstein (Hain) 1981, p. 43, 23-28)

ἡ γὰρ Ἀθηνᾶ τριττῶς, ὡς πολλάκις εἶπον, ἀλληγορεῖται· κατὰ μὲν γὰρ ποιητικὴν αὐτονομίαν καὶ ἄδειαν, ἣν πρώτους τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους φησὶν ὁ Χαιρήμων διδάξαι θέλοντας δι' ἀλληγοριῶν καὶ μύθων τὰ περὶ τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ὑψηλῶν τοῖς ἀτελεστέροις διδάσκειν, μυθικῶς Ἀθηνᾶ λέγεταί τις εἶναι θεά. τοῦτο δὲ τριττῶς ἀλληγορεῖται τὸ μυθικόν. Κτλ.

of Polles, Athenaeus, Chaeremon, Artemidorus the son of Phocas, and of certain other famous augurs[2] bore witness in support of his opinion[3].

Test. 12 : Tzetzes, *Exegesis of the Iliad* I 193

For Athena, as I have often said, can be allegorized in three ways. For according to poetic licence and freedom, which Chaeremon says the Egyptians were the first to teach — since they wanted to teach the great and lofty things to the uninitiated by means of allegories and myths[1] —, Athena is, mythically spoken, a goddess. And this mythical element can be allegorized in three ways : etc.

FRAGMENTA

Fragmenta Certa

Fragm. 1: Josephus, *Contra Apionem* I 288-292 (ed. B. Niese)

μετὰ τοῦτον ἐξετάσαι βούλομαι Χαιρήμονα. καὶ γὰρ οὗτος Αἰγυπτιακὴν φάσκων ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν καὶ προσθεὶς ταὐτὸ ὄνομα τοῦ βασιλέως ὅπερ ὁ Μανεθὼς Ἀμένωφιν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Ῥαμέσσην, φησὶν ὅτι
289 κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους ἡ Ἶσις ἐφάνη τῷ Ἀμενώφει μεμφομένη αὐτὸν ὅτι τὸ ἱερὸν αὐτῆς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ κατέσκαπται. Φριτιβαύτην δὲ ἱερογραμματέα φάναι, ἐὰν τῶν τοὺς μολυσμοὺς ἐχόντων ἀνδρῶν καθάρῃ τὴν Αἴγυπτον,
290 παύσεσθαι τῆς πτοίας αὐτόν. ἐπιλέξαντα δὲ τῶν ἐπισινῶν μυριάδας εἰκοσιπέντε ἐκβαλεῖν. ἡγεῖσθαι δ᾽ αὐτῶν γραμματέας Μωϋσῆν τε καὶ Ἰώσηπον, καὶ τοῦτον ἱερογραμματέα, Αἰγύπτια δ᾽ αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα εἶναι τῷ μὲν
291 Μωϋσεῖ Τισιθέν, τῷ δὲ Ἰωσήπῳ Πετεσήφ. τούτους δ᾽ εἰς Πηλούσιον ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἐπιτυχεῖν μυριάσι τριακονταοκτὼ καταλελειμμέναις ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀμενώφιος, ἃς οὐ θέλειν εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον διακομίζειν· οἷς φιλίαν συνθεμένους
292 ἐπὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον στρατεῦσαι. τὸν δὲ Ἀμένωφιν οὐχ ὑπομείναντα τὴν ἔφοδον αὐτῶν εἰς Αἰθιοπίαν φυγεῖν καταλιπόντα τὴν γυναῖκα ἔγκυον, ἣν κρυβομένην ἔν τισι σπηλαίοις τεκεῖν παῖδα ὄνομα Ῥαμέσσην, ὃν ἀνδρωθέντα ἐκδιῶξαι τοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἰς τὴν Συρίαν ὄντας περὶ εἴκοσι μυριάδας καὶ τὸν πατέρα Ἀμένωφιν ἐκ τῆς Αἰθιοπίας καταδέξασθαι. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Χαιρήμων.

Fragm. 2: Michael Psellus, Πρὸς τοὺς ἐρωτήσαντας πόσα γένη τῶν φιλοσοφουμένων λόγων (edd. E. Kurtz - F. Drexl, *Michaelis Pselli scripta minora* I, Milano 1936, 443-446)

πρῶτόν γε διαλύσομαι τούτοις τὴν ἀμφισβήτησιν, ἀμφότεροι γὰρ πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ χρόνου πρεσβείων ἐρίζουσι · Χαλδαῖοι μὲν γὰρ
444 ἄνω που εἰς μυριάδας ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα τὴν ἑαυτῶν σοφίαν ὑπερεκτείνουσιν, Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τὸν ἀριθμὸν μυθεύομενοι ὑπερπαίουσι, καὶ Χαλδαῖοι μὲν διδασκάλους ἑαυτοὺς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων εἰσάγουσιν, Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς μαθητιᾶν τοὺς Χαλδαίους μεγαλαυχοῦσιν ἀκριβέστερόν τε εἰδέναι τὰς τῶν οὐρανίων κινήσεις ἥπερ ἐκεῖνοι.

Ἐγὼ δὲ Χαιρήμονι τῷ σοφῷ ἐντυχών, ἀνδρὶ γενναίῳ καὶ ἐλλογίμῳ ἱστορίαν συναγαγεῖν, εὗρον προτερεύουσαν τὴν τῶν Χαλδαίων σοφίαν τῆς σπουδαζομένης παρ᾽ Αἰγυπτίοις, διδασκάλους δὲ οὐδένας τῶν ἄλλων, ἀλλ᾽ ἀμφοτέρους προστατῶν ἰδίων τετυχηκότας. καὶ ψεύδονται τοῦτο Χαλδαῖοι ἀπὸ αἰτίας τοιαύτης· ἐπέκλυσέ ποτε τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις τὴν χώραν ὁ

THE FRAGMENTS

Fragm. 1 : Josephus, *Contra Apionem* I 288-292[1]

After him (*sc.* Manetho) I want to examine Chaeremon. This writer likewise professes to write the history of Egypt, and he agrees with Manetho[2] in giving the names of Amenophis and Ramesses to the king and his son[3]. He then says that Isis appeared to Amenophis in his sleep and reproached him for the destruction of the temple in the war[4]. The sacred scribe Phritibautes[5] told him that if he purged Egypt of its polluted population, he would cease to be alarmed[6]. The king thereupon collected 250.000 diseased persons and banished them. Their leaders were scribes, Moses and Joseph[7], the latter even being a sacred scribe. Their Egyptian names were Tisithen, for Moses, and Peteseph, for Joseph[8]. The exiles on reaching Pelusium[9] met with a group of 380.000 persons left there by Amenophis, who did not want to bring them over to Egypt[10]. With these the exiles concluded an alliance and marched against Egypt. Amenophis did not wait for their attack but fled to Ethiopia leaving his wife pregnant[11]. She hid herself in some caverns and gave birth to a son named Ramesses[12]. He, on reaching manhood, drove the Jews, to the number of about 200.000[14], into Syria, and received his father Amenophis back from Ethiopia. Such is Chaeremon's account[15].

Fragm. 2 : Michael Psellus, Πρὸς τοὺς ἐρωτήσαντας πόσα γένη τῶν φιλοσοφουμένων λόγων pp. 443-446

I will first put an end to their quarrel (*sc.* between the Chaldaeans and the Egyptians)[1], for they contend with one another about chronological priorities. For the Chaldaeans date their own wisdom back about 400.000 years into history[2], while the Egyptians surpass even this number in their traditions. And the Chaldaeans present themselves as the teachers of the Egyptians, whereas the Egyptians boast that it was the Chaldaeans who wished to become disciples of them and that they themselves had a more exact knowledge of the movements of the heavenly bodies than those people.

Now, when I read the wise Chaeremon, a man noble-minded and in high repute for the composition of his *History*[3], I found that[4] the wisdom of the Chaldaeans is older than the one zealously practised among the Egyptians, but that neither people was the teacher of the other, but that both have their own champions. And the Chaldaeans tell this falsehood

Νεῖλος καὶ τά τε ἄλλα τούτων διέφθειρε καὶ ὁπόσα τῶν ἀστρονομουμένων ἐς βιβλία συγγεγεννήκασιν. εἶτα δεῆσαν αὐτοὺς γνῶναι ἐκλείψεις τε καὶ συνόδους παρὰ Χαλδαίων τὰς ἀφορμὰς τούτων συνηρανίσαντο. πονηροὶ δὲ οὗτοι περὶ τὴν μετάδοσιν γεγονότες τούς τε χρόνους τοῖς λόγοις μετήλλαξαν καὶ τὰς κινήσεις τῶν τε πλανήτων καὶ ἀπλανῶν παρὰ τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶν ἐκδεδώκασιν. εἶτα πρὸς τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἐξαπορουμένους τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ὁμιλητὰς ἑαυτοὺς ἐκείνων ἐγκαταστήσασθαι καὶ μετενεγκόντας ἐπὶ σφᾶς τὴν ἀληθινὴν γνῶσιν τῶν ὄντων ἐν ὀπταῖς πλίνθοις ταῦτα ἐγγράψασθαι, ἵνα μήτε πῦρ αὐτῶν ἅπτοιτο μήτε ὕδωρ ἐπικλύσαν λυμαίνοι.

Οὕτω μὲν οὖν Αἰγύπτιοι ἀτυχήσαντες περὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν σοφίαν παρὰ Χαλδαίων ἀπατηθέντες αὖθις τοῦ σκόπου τετυχήκασιν. ἦρξε δὲ τούτοις τῆς σοφίας ὁ παλαίτατος Νίνος, μεθ' ὃν τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος Ἰωάννης γενόμενος ἐκ τῆς μεσημβρινῆς ζώνης ἀφίκετο, ἰχθύος ἡμφιεσμένος δοράν, ἀφ' Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος ἑαυτὸν γενεαλογῶν. ὃς δὴ καὶ
445 πρῶτον αὐτῶν βεβασίλευκεν, ἀπάτῃ περιελθὼν καὶ τὴν γενομένην ἐξ ἀνάγκης σεληνιακὴν ἐπισκότησιν ὡς ἐσομένην ἐπαπειλήσας, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ βασιλεύεσθαι θέλοιεν. ἀφ' οὗ δὴ πολλοστὸς Πρωτεὺς ἦρξεν αὐτῶν· μεθ' ὃν δὴ Ῥαψίνιτος, ὃν δὴ καὶ ζῶντα ἐς ᾅδην Αἰγυπτίων μῦθοι κατάγουσι καὶ αὖθις ἀνάγουσι, συγκυβεύσαντα τῇ Δήμητρι καὶ νικήσαντα καὶ λαβόντα παρ' αὐτῆς χειρόμακτρον χρύσεον.

Σοφία δὲ Αἰγυπτίων τὸ πάντα λέγειν συμβολικῶς τά τε τῶν θεῶν εἴδη ἐν κιβωτίοις ἀποκρύπτειν, τὴν Σφίγγα δὲ μόνην ἀπὸ τῶν τειχῶν ἀποκρεμαννύειν. περιττοὶ δὲ διαφερόντως τὴν σοφίαν Αἰγύπτιοι, ὡς καὶ ὁ λόγος φησίν. οὗτοι γὰρ πρῶτοι τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπαθανατίσαντες ἔλξεσι καὶ πλάναις ἀμυθήτοις ἠνάγκασαν καὶ μέχρι πόας καὶ λίθου καταβιβάσαντες αὖθις εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν ζώνην ἀποκατέστησαν. μίαν δὲ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀρχὴν ἐπιστήσαντες παίζουσιν ἐν τοῖς μετ' ἐκείνην θεοῖς· Ἴακχος οὖν παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ Πρίαπος Σάραπίς τε καὶ Σειληνὸς καὶ Σατύρων γένος ἀλλόμορφον· ἱεράκων τε μορφαὶ καὶ ἴβεων ἀναπληροῦσιν αὐτοῖς τὸν χορὸν τῶν θεῶν· καὶ ὁ Ἆπις αὐτοῖς μόσχος θεός, ἐπειδὴ τἆλλα μέλας ὢν λευκὸν ἔχει τὸ μέτωπον. τὰς δὲ φύσεις οἶμαι τῶν γιγνομένων μὴ μάλα εἰδότες σκίλλαν τιμῶσι καὶ κρόμμυα, ὅτι αὐτομάτως βλαστάνουσι, καὶ τὸν ἄγνον, ὅτι ὑποστρωννύμενος εἰς ἁγνείαν πιστεύεται, καὶ τὴν Ἡράκλειον λίθον, ὅτι ἐφέλκεται τὸ σιδήριον, τήν τε μυῖαν τόν τε κάνθαρον καὶ τὴν μηλολόνθην καὶ τἆλλα τῶν ζῴων ὅσα μὴ ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἔχει τὴν γένεσιν. μάλιστα δὲ θαυμάζουσι τὸν κηροδύτην καὶ τὴν ἔγχελυν καὶ τὸν γῦπα καὶ τὰ μεταμειβόμενα ἀφ' ἑτέρου γένους εἰς

for the following reason. The Nile once flooded the country of the Egyptians * and destroyed, besides their other possessions, all the astronomical data which they had collected in books. Then, because they needed to know the eclipses and conjunctions, they collected the basic data about these from the Chaldaeans. The latter, however, being malicious in the matter of communicating these data, altered the times in their calculations and * gave out the movements of the planets and fixed stars contrary to their natural order. Then, when the Egyptians were in great uncertainty concerning the principles, they made themselves the disciples of the Chaldaeans and brought home the true knowledge of reality and inscribed these subjects on baked bricks in order that neither fire could touch them nor the water, when it overflows, could damage them[5].

And so the Egyptians, who were unfortunate with regard to their own wisdom, again gained their end after having been deceived by the Chaldaeans. Their own wisdom was inaugurated by the very old Ninos. The fourteenth after him, Ioannes, came from the southern zone clothed in a fish-skin, and he traced his pedigree to Hermes and Apollo[6]. He, in fact, was the one who first ruled as king over them; he cheated them by holding out as a threat that there would come an eclipse of the moon (which actually came of necessity) if they did not want to be ruled by a king. One of the many kings who ruled over them since then was Proteus; and after him Rhapsinitus, of whom the Egyptian traditions say that he went down to Hades as a living being and came up again after he had played at dice with Demeter, prevailed over her and taken her golden headcloth from her.

Egyptian wisdom is[7] to say all things symbolically[8], to conceal the images of the gods in little boxes and to hang from the walls only the Sphinx. Egyptians are very remarkable in their wisdom, as indeed tradition says. For they were the first people to represent the soul as immortal and they compelled it with unspeakable attractions and wanderings and, having forced it to come down even into grass and stone, they restored it again to its own zone[9]. Having established one principle for the universe, they deal playfully with the gods below it[10]: they have Iacchus, Priapus, Sarapis, Silenus, and a kind of strange-shaped Satyrs[11]. And forms of falcons and ibises fill their choir of gods. Also the bull Apis is a god in their eyes, because it has a white forehead whereas the rest is black. Because, I think, they do not know very well the nature of growing things, they honour the squill and onions since these bud of themselves, and the chaste-tree because it is believed to induce chastity[12] when strewn in bed, and the magnet because it attracts iron, and the fly and the beetle and the cockchafer and all other animals that are not born in genetic succession[13]. Most of all they admire the bumble-bee[14], the eel, and the vulture, and those animals that change from one species into another.

ἕτερον. μετροῦσι δὲ τὰς οὐρανίους κινήσεις ὡς ἄριστα καὶ τὸν ἥλιον θεὸν
446 ἥγηνται μέγιστον, ψυχάς τε πᾶσι τοῖς ἄστροις διδόασι, καὶ συμπάθειαν τοῖς οὖσιν εἰσάγουσιν ἄρρητον, οἷόν τε τὰ διῃρημένα, εἰ ἔλθοιεν ἐς ταὐτὸ πρὸς τόνδε ἢ τόνδε τὸν πλάνητα, συμπαθεῖν, οἷον Κρῆσσαν βοτάνην καὶ πτέρον Αἰγύπτιον καὶ ὀστέον Ἰβηρικόν, χρησμοῖς τε προσανέχουσι, καὶ τὸ Ἀμφιάρεω μαντεῖον μάλιστα ἡγοῦνται πιστότατον. τοιαύτη μὲν καὶ ἡ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων σοφία.

Fragm. 3: Origen, *Contra Celsum* I 59 (ed. M. Borret, Sources Chrétiennes 132, Paris (Du Cerf) 1967, p. 236)

ἐπὶ μεγάλοις τετήρηται πράγμασι καὶ μεγίσταις μεταβολαῖς τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀνατέλλειν τοὺς τοιούτους ἀστέρας, σημαίνοντας ἢ μεταστάσεις βασιλειῶν ἢ πολέμους ἢ ὅσα δύναται ἐν ἀνθρώποις συμβῆναι, σεῖσαι τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς δυνάμενα. ἀνέγνωμεν δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ κομητῶν Χαιρήμονος τοῦ Στωϊκοῦ συγγράμματι τίνα τρόπον ἔσθ' ὅτε καὶ ἐπὶ χρηστοῖς ἐσομένοις κομῆται ἀνέτειλαν, καὶ ἐκτίθεται τὴν περὶ τούτων ἱστορίαν.

Fragm. 4: Porphyry, *Epistula ad Anebonem* II 8-9 (ed. A.R. Sodano, Naples (Arte Tipografica) 1958, pp. 18-21)

(8) πάνυ δέ με θράττει πῶς ὡς κρείττους παρακαλούμενοι ἐπιτάττονται ὡς χείρους καὶ δίκαιον εἶναι ἀξιοῦντες τὸν θεράποντα, τὰ ἄδικα αὐτοὶ κελευσθέντες δρᾶν ὑπομένουσιν καὶ καθαρῷ μὲν μὴ ὄντι ἐξ ἀφροδισίων οὐκ ἂν καλοῦντι ὑπακούσαιεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἄγειν εἰς παράνομα ἀφροδίσια τοὺς τυχόντας οὐκ ὀκνοῦσιν. καὶ ἀπὸ ἐμψύχων ἀποχῆς μὲν κελεύουσιν δεῖν εἶναι τοὺς ὑποφήτας, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων ἀτμοῖς χραίνωνται, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀτμοῖς τοῖς ἀπὸ θυσιῶν μάλιστα δελεάζονται, καὶ νεκροῦ μὲν ἀθιγῆ δεῖν εἶναι τὸν ἐπόπτην, διὰ νεκρῶν δὲ τὰ πολλὰ ζῴων αἱ θεαγωγίαι ἐκτελοῦνται.

πολλῷ δὲ τούτων ἀλογώτερον τὸ μὴ δαίμονι, εἰ τύχοι, ἢ ψυχῇ τεθνηκότος, αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἡλίῳ ἢ Σελήνῃ ἤ τινι τῶν κατ' οὐρανὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ τυχόντι ὑποχείριον ἀπειλὰς προσφέροντα ἐκφοβεῖν, ψευδόμενον ἵν' ἐκεῖνοι ἀληθεύσωσι. τὸ γὰρ λέγειν ὅτι τὸν οὐρανὸν προσαράξει καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς Ἴσιδος ἐκφανεῖ καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀβύδῳ ἀπόρρητον δείξει καὶ τὴν βᾶριν στήσει καὶ τὰ μέλη τοῦ Ὀσίριδος διασκεδάσει τῷ Τυφῶνι, τίνα οὐχ ὑπερβολὴν ἐμπληξίας μὲν τῷ ἀπειλοῦντι ἃ μήτε οἶδεν μήτε δύναται, καταλείπει, ταπεινότητος δὲ τοῖς δεδοικόσιν οὕτως κενὸν φόβον καὶ πλάσματα, ὡς κομιδῇ παῖδες ἀνόητοι; καίτοι καὶ Χαιρήμων ὁ ἱερογραμματεὺς ἀναγράφει ταῦτα, ὡς καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις θρυλούμενα, καὶ ταῦτά φασιν εἶναι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα βιαστικώτατα.

They measure the movements of the heavenly bodies in the best possible way and regard the sun as the greatest god, and they attribute souls to all the stars. And they implant an ineffable affinity into reality, so that it is possible that separate entities could feel this affinity if they would come together on this or that planet[15], for instance, a Cretan herb, an Egyptian feather, and a Spanish bone. They rely on oracles and they believe that Amphiaraus' oracle shrine is by far the most trustworthy. Such * is the wisdom of the Egyptians[16].

Fragm. 3: Origen, *Contra Celsum* I 59[1]

It has been observed that at great events and at the most important changes of earthly affairs, stars of this kind appear which signify either changes of kingdoms, or wars, or whatever may happen among men which can shake earthly affairs. And we have read in the book *On Comets* by Chaeremon the Stoic how comets have sometimes appeared even when good events were about to happen, and he gives an account of these[2].

Fragm. 4: Porphyry, *Epistula ad Anebonem* II 8-9[1]

(8) It troubles me very much how they (*sc.* the gods), although invoked as superiors, can yet receive orders as if they were inferiors; and how, although requiring the worshipper to be just, they yet submit when commanded to do injustice themselves; and how they refuse to listen to one who is not clear of sexual pleasures when he calls upon them, although they themselves do not hesitate to lure just anyone to illicit sexual pleasures. They also command that their priests must abstain from animal food so as to avoid being stained by the vapours from the carcasses, although they themselves are strongly allured by vapours from sacrifices; and (they command) that the initiate must not touch a dead body, although it is for the most part by means of dead animals that the gods are evoked.

But much more absurd than this is that by means of threats a man — who is himself subject to any influence whatsoever — should attempt to frighten not just a chance demon or the soul of a dead man, but king Helios himself and Selene or any other in heaven[2], therefore uttering lies in order to make them speak the truth. For[3] to say that he will shatter the heaven and disclose the secrets of Isis and show the ineffable secret in Abydos[4] and stop the solar bark[5] and scatter the limbs of Osiris for Typhon[6] — is this not the result of an excessive stupidity on the part of him who threatens things that he neither knows nor can do, and an excessive degradation of those who have been frightened by a vain fear and by fictions, quite like silly children? And yet even Chaeremon the sacred scribe records these things as common talk also among the Egyptians, and they say that these and similar methods have a very forcible effect (upon the gods).

(9) αὐταὶ δὲ αἱ εὐχαὶ τίνα ἔχουσιν λόγον, τὸν ἐξ ἰλύος ἀναφανέντα λέγουσαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ λωτῷ καθήμενον καὶ ἐπὶ πλοίου ναυτιλλόμενον καὶ καθ' ὥραν τὰς μορφὰς ἀμείβοντα καὶ κατὰ ζῴδιον μετασχηματιζόμενον; οὕτω γάρ φασιν αὐτοπτεῖσθαι, ἀγνοοῦντες ὅτι τὸ ἴδιον πάθος τῆς αὐτῶν φαντασίας ἐκείνῳ περιάπτουσιν.

Fragm. 5: Porphyry, *Epistula ad Anebonem* II 12-13 (ed. Sodano, pp. 23-25)

Χαιρήμων μὲν γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οὐδ' ἄλλο τι πρὸ τῶν ὁρωμένων κόσμων ἡγοῦνται, ἐν ἀρχῆς λόγῳ τιθέμενοι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίων οὐδ' ἄλλους θεοὺς πλὴν τῶν πλανήτων λεγομένων καὶ τῶν συμπληρούντων τὸν ζῳδιακὸν καὶ ὅσοι τούτοις παρανατέλλουσιν, τάς τε εἰς τοὺς δεκανοὺς τομὰς καὶ τοὺς ὡροσκόπους καὶ τοὺς λεγομένους κραταιοὺς ἡγεμόνας, ὧν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν τοῖς Σαλμεσχινιακοῖς φέρεται καὶ θεραπεῖαι παθῶν καὶ ἀνατολαὶ καὶ δύσεις καὶ μελλόντων σημειώσεις.

ἑώρα γὰρ τοὺς τὸν ἥλιον δημιουργὸν φαμένους καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν Ὄσιριν καὶ τὴν Ἶσιν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἱερατικοὺς μύθους ἢ εἰς τοὺς ἀστέρας καὶ τὰς τούτων φάνσεις καὶ κρύψεις καὶ ἐπιτολὰς ἑλιττομένους ἢ εἰς τὰς τῆς σελήνης αὐξήσεις καὶ μειώσεις ἢ εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου πορείαν ἢ τό γε νυκτερινὸν ἡμισφαίριον ἢ τὸ ἡμερινὸν ἢ τόν γε ποταμόν, καὶ ὅλως πάντα εἰς τὰ φυσικὰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰς ἀσωμάτους καὶ ζώσας οὐσίας ἑρμηνεύοντας.

(13) ὧν οἱ πλείους καὶ τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀστέρων ἀνῆψαν κινήσεως, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως δεσμοῖς ἀλύτοις ἀνάγκης, ἣν Εἱμαρμένην λέγουσιν, πάντα καταδήσαντες καὶ πάντα τούτοις ἀνάψαντες τοῖς θεοῖς, οὓς ὡς λυτῆρας τῆς Εἱμαρμένης μόνους ἔν τε ἱεροῖς καὶ ξοάνοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεραπεύουσιν.

Fragm. 6: Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* III 9, 15 (ed. K. Mras, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 43,1 : Eusebius 8,1, Berlin (Akademie Verlag) 1954, p. 130)

καὶ ὁ Χαιρήμων δὲ μικρῷ ἔμπροσθεν ἐμαρτύρει οὐδ' ἄλλο τι πρὸ τοῦ ὁρωμένου κόσμου τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἡγεῖσθαι οὐδ' ἄλλους θεοὺς πλὴν τῶν πλανήτων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀστέρων, πάντα τε εἰς τὰ ὁρώμενα τοῦ κόσμου μέρη καὶ οὐδὲν εἰς ἀσωμάτους καὶ ζώσας οὐσίας ἑρμηνεύοντας.

Fragm. 7: Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* III 13, 8 (ed. Mras, p. 147)

ὁ δὲ καὶ τὰς Αἰγυπτιακὰς μυθολογίας πάλιν ἐπὶ ἀσωμάτους μεταφέρει δυνάμεις, λαθὼν ὁ σοφώτατος αὐτὸς ἑαυτόν. ἀκήκοας γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν ὅπως τὸν Χαιρήμονα καὶ πλείους ἄλλους ὡμολόγει μηδ' ἄλλο τι πρὸ τῶν ὁρωμένων κόσμων ἡγεῖσθαι ἐν ἀρχῆς τε λόγῳ τίθεσθαι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους·

(9) What sense do the very prayers have that speak of him who emerges out of the mud and is sitting upon the lotus[7], and who sails in a ship, and who changes his shape every hour by being transfigured according to the signs of the zodiac[8]? For thus, they say, they experience a direct vision of him, not knowing that they attribute to him a peculiar impression of their own imagination[9].

Fragm. 5: Porphyry, *Epistula ad Anebonem* II 12-13[1]

For Chaeremon and the others do not believe in anything prior to the visible worlds[2], stating that the basic principles are the gods of the Egyptians and that there are no other gods than the so-called planets[3], and those stars which fill up the zodiac, and all those that rise near them[4], and the sections relating to the decans[5], and the horoscopes[6], and the so-called mighty rulers[7]. Of these both their names and their treatments of diseases, * and their risings and settings, and their indications of future events can be found in the *Salmeschiniaca*[8].

For he saw[9] that those who say that the sun is the creator (demiurge) make the stories of Osiris and Isis and all other priestly tales refer either to the stars and their appearances and disappearances and risings in which they revolve, or to the waxings and wanings of the moon, or to the course of the sun, or to the hemisphere of the night or the day, or to the river[10], and, in general, that they interpret everything as referring to physical things and nothing in reference to incorporeal or living beings[11].

(13) And the majority of them made even what is in our own power depend upon the movements of the stars, binding all things down, I do not know how, by indissoluble bonds of necessity, which they call *Heimarmene*, and making all things depend upon those gods whom they worship, by temples and statues and in other ways, as the sole liberators from *Heimarmene*[12].

Fragm. 6: Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* III 9, 15[1]

And just before, we had Chaeremon as a witness that the Egyptians believed in nothing prior to the visible world nor in any other gods than the planets and the other stars, and that they interpreted all things as referring to the visible parts of the world and nothing in reference to incorporeal and living beings.

Fragm. 7: Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* III 13, 8

But the very wise man (*sc.* Porphyry) unawares makes the Egyptian mythologies again refer to immaterial powers. For you have heard in preceding chapters that he admitted that Chaeremon and most of the others believed in nothing else prior to the visible worlds and gave the Egyptians pride of

τούτους γὰρ πάντα εἰς τὰ φυσικὰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰς ἀσωμάτους καὶ ζώσας οὐσίας ἑρμηνεύειν.

Fragm. 8 : Porphyry, *Epistula ad Anebonem* II 15 (ed. Sodano, pp. 26-27)

εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ τούτων ἀπαλλαγέντας ἐκεῖνο εἰπεῖν, οὐ καλῶς μοι δοκεῖς τὸ ἀδύνατον εἰς γνῶσιν τῆς μαθηματικῆς ἐπιστήμης συλλογίζεσθαι, διότι πολλὴ διαφωνία περὶ αὐτὴν γέγονεν, ἢ ὅτι Χαιρήμων ἢ ἄλλος τις πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀντείρηκεν.

Fragm. 9: Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis* VIII 4 (ed. E. des Places, Paris (Les Belles Lettres) 1966, p. 198)

Χαιρήμων δὲ καὶ οἵτινες ἄλλοι τῶν περὶ τὸν κόσμον ἅπτονται πρώτων αἰτίων, τὰς τελευταίας ἀρχὰς ἐξηγοῦνται· ὅσοι τε τοὺς πλάνητας καὶ τὸν ζωδιακὸν τούς τε δεκανοὺς καὶ ὡροσκόπους καὶ τοὺς λεγομένους κραταιοὺς καὶ ἡγεμόνας παραδιδόασι, τὰς μεριστὰς τῶν ἀρχῶν διανομὰς ἀναφαίνουσιν. τά τε ἐν τοῖς Σαλμεσχινιακοῖς μέρος τι βραχύτατον περιέχει τῶν Ἑρμαϊκῶν διατάξεων· καὶ τὰ περὶ ἀστέρων ἢ φάσεων ἢ κρύψεων ἢ σελήνης αὐξήσεων ἢ μειώσεων ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις εἶχε τὴν παρ᾽ Αἰγυπτίοις αἰτιολογίαν.

Fragm. 10 : Porphyry, *De Abstinentia* IV 6-8 (edd. J. Bouffartigue - M. Patillon, Paris (Les Belles Lettres), forthcoming)

6. τὰ γοῦν κατὰ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἱερέας Χαιρήμων ὁ Στωϊκὸς ἀφηγούμενος, οὓς καὶ φιλοσόφους ὑπειλῆφθαί φησι παρ᾽ Αἰγυπτίοις, ἐξηγεῖται ὡς τόπον μὲν ἐξελέξαντο ἐμφιλοσοφῆσαι τὰ ἱερά. πρός τε γὰρ τὴν ὅλην ὄρεξιν τῆς θεωρίας συγγενὲς ἦν παρὰ τοῖς ἐκείνων ἀφιδρύμασι διαιτᾶσθαι, παρεῖχέν τε αὐτοῖς ἀσφάλειαν μὲν ἐκ τοῦ θείου σεβασμοῦ καθάπερ τινὰ ἱερὰ ζῷα πάντων τιμώντων τοὺς φιλοσόφους, ἠρεμαίοις δὲ εἶναι, ἅτε τῆς ἐπιμιξίας κατὰ τὰς πανηγύρεις καὶ τὰς ἑορτὰς συντελουμένης μόνον, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν σχεδὸν ἀβάτων ὄντων τοῖς ἄλλοις τῶν ἱερῶν· ἀγνεύσαντας γὰρ ἔδει προσιέναι καὶ πολλῶν ἀποσχομένους. καὶ τοῦτο ὥσπερ κοινὸς τῶν κατ᾽ Αἴγυπτον ἱερῶν θεσμός ἐστιν. ἀπειπάμενοι δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν ἄλλην ἐργασίαν καὶ πόρους ἀνθρωπίνους, ἀπέδοσαν ὅλον τὸν βίον τῇ τῶν θείων θεωρίᾳ καὶ θεάσει, διὰ μὲν ταύτης τό τε τίμιον καὶ ἀσφαλὲς καὶ εὐσεβὲς πορίζόμενοι, διὰ δὲ τῆς θεωρίας τὴν ἐπιστήμην, δι᾽ ἀμφοῖν δὲ ἄσκησιν ἠθῶν κεκρυμμένην τινὰ καὶ ἀρχαιοπρεπῆ. τὸ γὰρ ἀεὶ συνεῖναι τῇ θείᾳ γνώσει καὶ ἐπιπνοίᾳ πάσης μὲν ἔξω τίθησιν πλεονεξίας, καταστέλλει δὲ τὰ πάθη, διεγείρει δὲ πρὸς σύνεσιν τὸν βίον. λιτότητα δὲ ἐπετήδευσαν καὶ καταστολὴν ἐγκράτειάν τε καὶ καρτερίαν τό τε ἐν παντὶ δίκαιον καὶ ἀπλεονέκτητον. σεμνοὺς δὲ αὐτοὺς παρεῖχεν καὶ τὸ δυσεπίμικτον· οἵ γε παρὰ μὲν αὐτὸν τῶν λεγομένων ἀγνειῶν τὸν καιρὸν οὐδὲ τοῖς συγγενεστάτοις καὶ ὁμοφύλοις ἐπεμίγνυντο σχεδὸν οὐδὲ ἄλλων τῳ θεωρούμενοι, ὅτι μὴ πρὸς τὰς

place[1], for these interpreted all things as referring to the physical world and nothing in reference to incorporeal and living beings.

Fragm. 8: Porphyry, *Epistula ad Anebonem* II 15[1]

But if it is necessary to say this apart from those things, it does not seem right to me that you conclude that it is impossible to know the science of astrology because there is so much discord about it, or because Chaeremon or some other one has spoken against it[2].

Fragm. 9: Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis* VIII 4[1]

Chaeremon and all the others who treat the first causes of the world explain these ultimate principles. Those who teach about the planets, the zodiac, the decans, the horoscopes, and the so-called 'mighty ones', and 'rulers', reveal the particular distributions of the principles. The things written in the *Salmeschiniaka* contain only a very small part of the Hermetic system. And the science of stars, or of their appearances or disappearances, or of the waxings or wanings of the moon had the Egyptian aetiology only in the last place[2].

Fragm. 10: Porphyry, *De Abstinentia* IV 6-8[1]

6. Chaeremon the Stoic tells in his exposé about the Egyptian priests, who, he says, were considered also as philosophers among the Egyptians, * that they chose the temples as the place to philosophize[2]. For to live close to their shrines was fitting to their whole desire of contemplation[3], and it gave them security because of the reverence for the divine, since all people honoured the philosophers as if they were a sort of sacred animals. And they were able to live a quiet life, as contact with other people occurred only at assemblies and festivals[4], whereas for the rest the temples were almost inaccessible to others[5]. For it was requisite that those who * approached them should have purified themselves and abstained from many things[6]. This, too, is as it were a common law of the Egyptian temples. They renounced every employment and human revenues[7], and devoted their whole life to contemplation and vision of the divine[8]. Through this vision they procured for themselves honour, security, and piety; through contemplation they procured knowledge; and through both a certain esoteric and venerable way of life. For to be always in contact with divine knowledge and inspiration keeps them far from all kinds of greediness, represses the passions, and incites them to live a life of understanding. They practised frugality and restraint, self-control and endurance, and in all things justice and freedom from avarice[9]. Their disinclination for social contacts made them impressive. During the time of the so-called purifications and fasts[10] they did not even have contact with their nearest kinsmen and those of

ἀναγκαίας συναγνεύουσι χρείας ἢ ἁγνευτήρια τοῖς μὴ καθαρεύουσιν ἄδυτα καὶ πρὸς ἱερουργίας ἅγια κατανεμόμενοις· τὸν δὲ ἄλλον χρόνον ἁπλούστερον μὲν τοῖς ὁμοίοις ἐπεμίγνυντο, τῶν δ' ἐξωτικῶν τῆς θρησκείας οὐδενὶ συνεβίουν· ἐφαίνοντο δὲ ἀεὶ θεῶν ἢ ἀγαλμάτων ἐγγύς, ἤτοι φέροντες ἢ προηγούμενοι ἢ τάσσοντες μετὰ κόσμου τε καὶ σεμνότητος· ὧν ἕκαστον οὐ τῦφος ἦν, ἀλλά τινος ἔνδειξις φυσικοῦ λόγου. τὸ δὲ σεμνὸν κἀκ τοῦ καταστήματος ἑωρᾶτο. πορεία τε γὰρ ἦν εὔτακτος καὶ βλέμμα καθεστηκὸς ἐπετηδεύετο, ὡς ὅτε βουληθεῖεν μὴ σκαρδαμύττειν· γέλως δὲ σπάνιος· εἰ δέ που γένοιτο, μέχρι μειδιάσεως. ἀεὶ δὲ ἐντὸς τοῦ σχήματος αἱ χεῖρες. καὶ σύμβολόν γε ἦν ἑκάστῳ τῆς τάξεως ἐμφαντικόν, ἣν ἔλαχεν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς· πλείους γὰρ ἦσαν αἱ τάξεις. δίαιτα δὲ λιτὴ καὶ ἀφελής· οἴνου γὰρ οἱ μὲν οὐδ' ὅλως, οἱ δὲ ὀλίγιστα ἐγεύοντο, νεύρων αἰτιώμενοι βλάβας καὶ πλήρωσιν κεφαλῆς ἐμπόδιον εἰς εὕρεσιν, ἀφροδισίων τε ἔφασαν αὐτὸν ὀρέξεις ἐπιφέρειν. ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εὐλαβῶς εἶχον, ἄρτοις μὲν οὐδὲ ὅλως ἐν ταῖς ἁγνείαις χρώμενοι· εἰ δέ ποτε μὴ ἁγνεύοιεν, σὺν ὑσσώπῳ κόπτοντες ἤσθιον· τὸ πολὺ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῆς δυνάμεως καθαιρεῖν ἔφασαν τὸν ὕσσωπον. ἐλαίου δ' ἀπείχοντο μὲν ὡς τὸ πολύ, οἱ πλεῖστοι δὲ καὶ παντελῶς· εἰ δέ που μετὰ λαχάνων χρήσαιντο, παντελῶς ὀλίγῳ καὶ ὅσον παρηγορῆσαι τὴν αἴσθησιν.

7. τῶν μὲν οὖν ἐκτὸς Αἰγύπτου γιγνομένων βρωμάτων τε καὶ ποτῶν οὐ θέμις ἦν ἅπτεσθαι· πολύς τις οὕτως τρυφῆς ἀπεκέκλειστο τόπος. τῶν δὲ κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἰχθύων τε ἀπείχοντο πάντων καὶ τετραπόδων ὅσα μώνυχα ἢ πολυσχιδῆ ἢ μὴ κερασφόρα· πτηνῶν δὲ ὅσα σαρκοφάγα· πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ καθάπαξ τῶν ἐμψύχων· καὶ ἔν γε ταῖς ἁγνείαις ἅπαντες, ὁπότε μηδ' ᾠὸν προσίεντο. καὶ μέντοι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οὐκ ἀσυκοφάντητον ἐποιοῦντο παραίτησιν, οἷον τῶν βοῶν τὰς θηλείας παρητοῦντο, τῶν δ' ἀρρένων ὅσα δίδυμα ἢ κατάσπιλα ἢ ἑτερόχροα ἢ παραλλάσσοντα τῇ μορφῇ ἢ δεδαμασμένα, ὡς ἤδη καθωσιωμένα τοῖς πόνοις ἢ τιμωμένοις ἐμφερῆ, [ἢ] καθ' ὅντιν' οὖν οἷον ἀπεικασμὸν ἐξείη, ἢ ἑτερόφθαλμα ἢ πρὸς ἀνθρωπείαν ἐμφέρειαν νεύοντα. μυρίαι δ' ἄλλαι παρατηρήσεις [καὶ] τῆς περὶ αὐτὰ τέχνης τῶν καλουμένων μοσχοσφραγιστῶν ἄχρι συντάξεων προάγουσαι βιβλιακῶν. περιεργότερον δ' ἔτι περὶ τὰ πτηνά, οἷον τρυγόνα μὴ ἐσθίειν· ἱέραξ γάρ, ἔφασαν, πολλαχῇ τὸ ζῷον συλλαβὼν ἀφίησιν, μισθὸν

their own blood, nor with almost anyone else when they were in contemplation, except with those who were pure and fasted together with them for the necessary duties[11], or with those who divided[12] among themselves the rooms of purification and fasting[13] which were inaccessible to those who were not pure and which were set apart for the religious services. But the rest of the time they moved more easily among those who were of their order, but they did not associate with anyone who stood wholly outside their religion[14]. They were always seen near the gods, or rather their statues, either carrying or preceding them in a procession or setting them up with order and dignity. And each of these acts was no empty gesture, but an indication of some allegorical truth[15]. Their gravity was also apparent from their behaviour. For their way of walking was disciplined[16], and they took care to have a quiet look[17], so that they did not blink when they wanted to do so. They seldom laughed, and when it did occur, it went no further than a smile[18]. They always kept their hands within their dress[19]. And each had a symbol indicative of the rank he had obtained in the hierarchy, for there were several ranks[20]. Their diet was frugal and simple[21], for as to wine, some did not drink it at all and others drank only very little of it[22], for they alleged that it caused injury of the nerves and dizziness of the head, which impedes research, and they said that it induced sexual desires[23]. In the same way they were also cautious with respect to other things: they did not use bread at all in the periods of purification and fasting[24]; and outside these periods, they ate it with hyssop, which they cut into pieces, for they said that hyssop reduces the great strength of it (*sc.* the bread)[25]. They abstained from oil for the most part, the majority of them even entirely. And if sometimes they used it with vegetables, they definitely took only a little, just enough to mitigate the taste (*sc.* of the vegetables).

7. They were not allowed to touch foods or drinks that were produced outside Egypt[26]. A great opportunity for luxury had been excluded in this way. As to the products of Egypt itself, they abstained from all kinds of fish[27], and from such quadrupeds as had uncloven hoofs or had toes or had no horns, and also from such birds as were carnivorous[28]. Many of them, however, even entirely abstained from all animals[29]. And in periods of fasting and purification all of them did so[30]; then they did not even eat an egg[31]. But also as to other kinds of food they practised a not unexceptionable rejection; e.g. they rejected the consumption of (female) cows[32], and of such male animals as were twins, or blemished, or piebald, or of unusual shape, or tamed (considering them as having been already consecrated by their labours), or those resembling animals that are honoured[33] — whatever imitation one may think of[34] — or one-eyed, or those that verged on a likeness to the human form[35]. There are innumerable other

ἀποδιδοὺς μίξεως σωτηρίαν· ὡς οὖν μὴ λάθοιεν τοιούτῳ περιπεσόντες, ἅπαν αὐτῶν περιίσταντο τὸ γένος. κοιναὶ μὲν δὴ θρησκεῖαί τινες αὗται, κατὰ γένη δὲ τῶν ἱερέων διάφοροι, καὶ οἰκεῖαι καθ' ἕκαστον θεόν· αἱ δὲ ἁγνεῖαι πάντων ἐκαθάρευον. ὁ δὲ χρόνος οὗτος ὁπότε συντελεῖν τι τῶν περὶ τὴν ἱερὰν μέλλοιεν θρησκείαν, προὐλάμβανον ἡμερῶν ἀριθμόν, οἱ μὲν δυεῖν καὶ τετταράκοντα, οἱ δὲ τούτων πλείους, οἱ δὲ ἐλάσσους, οὐδέποτε μέντοι τῶν ἑπτὰ λειπομένας, παντὸς μὲν ἐμψύχου ἀπείχοντο, παντὸς δὲ λαχάνου τε καὶ ὀσπρίου, πρὸ δὲ πάντων ἀφροδισίων ὁμιλίας γυναικείας· ἄρρενος μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον μετεῖχον. τρὶς δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἀπελούοντο ψυχρῷ, ἀπό τε κοίτης καὶ πρὸ ἀρίστου καὶ πρὸς ὕπνον. εἰ δέ ποτε συμβαίη καὶ ὀνειρώττειν, παραχρῆμα ἀπεκάθαιρον λουτρῷ τὸ σῶμα. ψυχρῷ μὲν οὖν καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἄλλον ἐχρῶντο βίον, οὐ μὴν οὑτωσὶ πλεονάζοντι. κοίτη δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν σπαδίκων τοῦ φοίνικος ἃς καλοῦσι βάις ἐπέπλεκτο· ξύλινον δὲ ἡμικυλίνδριον εὖ λελεασμένον ὑπόθημα τῆς κεφαλῆς. ἤσκουν δὲ διψᾶν καὶ πεινᾶν καὶ ὀλιγοσιτίαν παρὰ πάντα τὸν βίον.

8. μαρτύρια δ' αὐτῶν τῆς ἐγκρατείας, ὅτι μήτε περιπάτοις ἢ αἰώραις χρώμενοι διῆγον ἄνοσοι καὶ πρὸς μετρίαν ἰσχὺν εὔτονοι. πολλὰ γοῦν κατὰ τὰς ἱερουργίας ἀνεδέχοντο βάρη καὶ ὑπηρετήματα τῆς κοινῆς ἰσχύος μείζω. διῆρουν δὲ νύκτα μὲν εἰς ἐπιτήρησιν οὐρανίων, ἐνίοτε δὲ ἁγιστείαν, ἡμέραν δὲ εἰς θεραπείαν τῶν θεῶν, καθ' ἣν ἢ τρὶς ἢ τετράκις, κατὰ τὴν ἕω [καὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν] μεσουρανοῦντά τε τὸν ἥλιον καὶ πρὸς δύσιν καταφερόμενον, τούτους ὑμνοῦντες· τὸν δὲ ἄλλον χρόνον πρὸς θεωρήμασιν ἦσαν ἀριθμητικοῖς τε καὶ γεωμετρικοῖς, ἐκπονοῦντες ἀεί τι καὶ προσεξευρίσκοντες, συνόλως τε περὶ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν καταγιγνόμενοι. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐν ταῖς χειμερίοις ἐπετήδευον νυξί, φιλολογίᾳ προσαγρυπνοῦντες, ἅτε μήτε πορισμοῦ ποιούμενοι φροντίδα δεσπότου τε κακοῦ τῆς πολυτελείας ἐλευθεριάζοντες. ὁ μὲν δὴ πόνος ὁ ἄτρυτος τε καὶ διηνεκὴς καρτερίαν ἀπομαρτυρεῖ τοῖς ἀνδράσι, τὸ δὲ ἀνεπιθύμητον ἐγκράτειαν· οἵ γε ἐν τοῖς ἀσεβεστάτοις ἐτίθεντο πλεῖν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου, διευλαβούμενοι ξενικὰς τρυφὰς καὶ ἐπιτηδεύ-

observations[36] in the art (concerning these animals) of the so-called calf-sealers[37], observations which even result in systematic treatises[38]. Still more elaborate (are the rules) concerning birds; for instance, that a turtle-dove should not be eaten. For they say this bird is often seized by a falcon that dismisses it thereafter, thus giving it its deliverance as a due reward for the intercourse[39]. In order not to come into contact with such a bird without perceiving it, they shunned their whole species.

These are some of the religious observances that were common to all, but there were others which varied according to the class of priests and were proper to each individual god. But the periods of purification and fasting observed by all (priests) were clean. This was the period when they were to perform something pertaining to the sacred rites. Then they spent a number of days in preparation[40], some forty-two, others more, others less, but never less than seven days[41]. And during this time they abstained from all animal food[42], from all vegetables and pulse[43], but above all from sexual intercourse with women[44], for (needless to say) they never at any time had intercourse with males. They washed themselves three times a day with cold water, *viz.*, when they rose from bed, before lunch, and before going to sleep[45]. But when they happened to have an ejaculation during their sleep, they immediately purified the body in a bath. In other daily matters they also used cold water, but not so very much. Their bed was woven from the branches of the palm-tree, which they call *bais*[46], and a well-smoothed semi-cylindrical piece of wood was their pillow[47]. They exercised themselves in enduring hunger and thirst and paucity of food during their whole life[48].

8. A testimony of their self-control is that, though they practised neither walking nor swinging exercises[49], they lived without disease[50] and were energetic enough for average activities. Therefore they took upon themselves many burdens in the performance of their religious rites and many services which required more than ordinary strength. They divided the night for the observation of the heavenly bodies, and sometimes for ritual, and the day for worship of the gods in which they sang hymns to them three or four times[51], in the morning [and the evening], when the sun is on the meridian, and when it is descending to the west. The rest of the time they spent with arithmetical and geometrical speculations[52], always trying to search out something and to make discoveries, and in general always busy with the pursuit of learning. In winter nights also they were occupied in the same activity, being awake because of their love of learning, since they need not care for earning a living and are free from that bad master, great expense[53]. Their limitless and incessant labour bears witness to the endurance of these men, the absence of desire to their self-control. It was considered by them to be most ungodly to sail from Egypt, because they

ματα· μόνοις γὰρ ὅσιον ἐδόκει τοῖς κατὰ τὰς βασιλικὰς χρείας ἐπηναγκασμένοις. πολὺς δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἦν λόγος ἐμμεῖναι τοῖς πατρίοις· μικρὰ δ' εἰ καταγνωσθεῖεν παραβαίνοντες, ἀπηλαύνοντο.

καὶ τὸ μὲν κατ' ἀλήθειαν φιλοσοφοῦν ἔν τε τοῖς προφήταις ἦν καὶ ἱεροστολισταῖς καὶ ἱερογραμματεῦσιν, ἔτι δὲ ὡρολόγοις. τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τῶν ἱερέων τε καὶ παστοφόρων καὶ νεωκόρων πλῆθος καὶ ὑπουργῶν τοῖς θεοῖς καθαρεύει μὲν ὁμοίως, οὔτι γε μὴν μετ' ἀκριβείας καὶ ἐγκρατείας τοσῆσδε. τοιαῦτα μὲν τὰ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς φιλαλήθους τε καὶ ἀκριβοῦς ἔν τε τοῖς Στωϊκοῖς πραγματικώτατα φιλοσοφήσαντος μεμαρτυρημένα.

Fragm. 11: Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* II 13 (ed. E. Bickel, *Diatribe in Senecae philosophi fragmenta* I, Leipzig (Teubner) 1915, pp. 415-6)

Cheremon stoicus, vir eloquentissimus, narrat de vita antiquorum Aegypti sacerdotum, quod omnibus mundi negotiis curisque postpositis semper in templo fuerint et rerum naturas causasque ac rationes siderum contemplati sint; numquam mulieribus se conmiscuerint, numquam cognatos et propinquos, ne liberos quidem viderint ex eo tempore, quo coepissent divino cultui deservire; carnibus et vino se semper abstinuerint propter tenuitatem sensus et vertiginem capitis, quam ex parvo cibo patiebantur, et maxime propter adpetitus libidinis, qui ex his cibis et ex hac potione nascuntur. pane raro vescebantur, ne onerarent stomachum; et si quando comedebant, tunsum pariter hysopum sumebant in cibo, ut escam graviorem illius calore decoquerent, oleum tantum in holeribus noverant, verum et ipsum parum propter nausiam et asperitatem gustus leniendam. 'quid loquar', inquit, 'de volatilibus, cum ovum quoque pro carnibus vitaverint et lac? quorum alterum carnes liquidas, alterum sanguinem esse dicebant colore mutato". cubile eis de foliis palmarum, quas 'baias' vocant, contextum erat. scabillum adcline et ex una parte obliquum in terram pro pulvillo capiti subponebant, bidui triduique inediam sustinentes; et umores corporis, qui nascuntur ex otio et ex mansione unius loci, nimia victus castigatione siccabant.

were on their guard against foreign luxury and pursuits. For this appeared to them to be lawful only to those who were compelled to do so by reason of requirements of the royal court. There was, indeed, a strong reason for them to remain faithful to the ancestral customs, for if they were convicted of trespassing even in a minor matter, they were excluded (*sc.* from the temples)[54].

The true philosophizing was found among[55] the prophets[56], the priests who had charge of the sacred vestments[57], the sacred scribes[58], and also the astrologers[59]. But the rest — the crowd of priests, shrine(?)-bearers[60], temple-wardens, and assistants[61] — practise the same rites of purification for the gods, yet not with such great accuracy and self-control. Such are the things testified about the Egyptians by a man who was a lover of truth and an accurate writer, and who was among the Stoics a very clever philosopher.

Fragm. 11 : Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* II 13[1]

Chaeremon the Stoic, a very eloquent man, tells about the life of the ancient priests of Egypt, that they were always in the temple, laying aside all worldly affairs and concerns, and that they contemplated the nature and causes of all things and the order of the stars. They never had any contact with women, and they never saw their kinsmen and relatives, not even their children, from the time they had begun to devote themselves to the veneration of the gods. They always abstained from meat and wine because of the weakness of the senses and the dizziness in the head which they experienced after a little (of this) food, but especially because of the strong sexual desires that are the results of these kinds of food and drink. They seldom ate bread, in order not to overload their stomachs; and if sometimes they did eat it, they also used pounded hyssop in the food so that by its heat they could consume the more heavy food. They used oil only with vegetables, but this too in small quantities in order to mitigate the nausea and the acid taste.

"What should I say", he said[2], "about birds, for they (*sc.* the priests) abstain from egg, too, as if it is meat, and from milk. They said that the former (*sc.* an egg) was liquid meat, the latter (*sc.* milk) blood with a changed colour".

Their bed was woven from palm-leaves, which they call *baiae*. They used to place a low foot-stool, leaning against something and slanting down on one side to the earth, under their head by way of a pillow when they sustained their fasting for two or three days. And the excretions of the body, which are the result of inactivity and of staying at one place, are dried up by them by means of an excessively rigorous diet[3].

Fragm. 12: Tzetzes, *Exegesis in Iliadem* I 97 (ed. A. Lolos, *Der unbekannte Teil der Ilias-Exegesis des Iohannes Tzetzes (A 97-609)*, Königstein (Hain) 1981, 11-12)

βαρείας χεῖρας ἀφέξει· ἥλιος καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα οὐ τόξα οὐχ ὅπλα οὐ χεῖρας οὐ μέλη οὐ μόρια οὐδὲ προαιρέσεις ψυχῆς ἔχουσιν· Ὅμηρος δέ, παιδευθεὶς ἀκριβῶς πᾶσαν μάθησιν ἐκ τῶν συμβολικῶν Αἰθιοπικῶν γραμμάτων ταῦτά φησιν· οἱ γὰρ Αἰθίοπες στοιχεῖα γραμμάτων οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ᾽ἀντ᾽αὐτῶν ζῷα παντοῖα καὶ μέλη τούτων καὶ μόρια· βουλόμενοι γὰρ οἱ ἀρχαιότεροι τῶν ἱερογραμματέων τὸν περὶ θεῶν φυσικὸν λόγον κρύπτειν, δι᾽ἀλληγορικῶν [καὶ] συμβόλων τοιούτων καὶ γραμμάτων τοῖς ἰδίοις τέκνοις παρεδίδουν αὐτά, ὡς ὁ ἱερογραμματεὺς Χαιρήμων φησίν· καὶ ἀντὶ μὲν χαρᾶς γυναῖκα τυμπανίζουσαν ἔγραφον· ἀντὶ δὲ λύπης ἄνθρωπον τῇ χειρὶ τὸ γένειον κρατοῦντα καὶ πρὸς γῆν νεύοντα· ἀντὶ δὲ συμφορᾶς ὀφθαλμὸν δακρύοντα· ἀντὶ τοῦ μὴ ἔχειν δύο χεῖρας κενὰς ἐκτεταμένας· ἀντὶ ἀνατολῆς ὄφιν ἐξερχόμενον ἔκ τινος ὀπῆς· ἀντὶ δύσεως εἰσερχόμενον· ἀντὶ ἀναβιώσεως βάτραχον· ἀντὶ ψυχῆς ἱέρακα· ἔτι καὶ ἀντὶ ἡλίου καὶ θεοῦ· ἀντὶ θηλυγόνου [γυναικὸς] καὶ μητρὸς καὶ χρόνου καὶ οὐρανοῦ γῦπα· ἀντὶ βασιλέως μέλισσαν· ἀντὶ γενέσεως καὶ αὐτοφυῶν καὶ ἀρρένων κάνθαρον· ἀντὶ γῆς βοῦν· λέοντος δὲ προτομὴ πᾶσαν ἀλκὴν καὶ φυλακὴν δηλοῖ κατ᾽αὐτούς· οὐρὰ λέοντος ἀνάγκην· ἔλαφος ἐνιαυτόν· ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ φοῖνιξ· ὁ παῖς δηλοῖ τὰ αὐξανόμενα· ὁ γέρων τὰ φθειρόμενα· τὸ τόξον τὴν ὀξεῖαν δύναμιν, καὶ ἕτερα μυρία· ἐξ ὧν Ὅμηρος ταῦτά φησιν· ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ τόπῳ, εἴπερ αἱρεῖσθε, ἰδὼν ἐκ τοῦ Χαιρήμονος, καὶ τὰς τῶν γραμμάτων αὐτῶν ἐκφωνήσεις Αἰθιοπικῶς εἴπω.

Fragm. 13: Tzetzes, *Chiliades* V 395-398 (ed. P.A.M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, Naples 1968, p. 182)

ὡς δ᾽ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ἱερογραμματεὺς Χαιρήμων
ἔδειξεν ἐν διδάγμασι τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων,
ὁ φοῖνιξ ἓξ τοῖς ἔτεσι καὶ ἑπτακισχιλίοις
θνήσκει, παραγενόμενος ἐν τόποις τοῖς Αἰγύπτου.

Fragm. 14: Apollonius Dyscolus, *De coniunctionibus* 6 (edd. R. Schneider - G. Uhlig, *Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt* I 1 = Grammatici Graeci II 1, 1, Leipzig (Teubner) 1878, pp. 247-248)

ἔτι δὲ καί τινές φασιν οὐ δεόντως αὐτοὺς συνδέσμους εἰρῆσθαι, εἴγε συνδέσεως λόγων οὐκ εἰσὶν αἴτιοι. καί φησι Χαιρήμων ὁ Στωϊκός, ὡς κατά τι εἴησαν ἂν σύνδεσμοι. «σύνδεσμον γάρ», φησι, «καλεῖσθαι καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν φωνὴν καὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆς δηλούμενον, ᾧ λόγῳ καί τινα ἕτερα

Fragm. 12: Tzetzes, *Exegesis in Iliadem* I 97[1]

"He will keep away his forceful hands" (A 97)[2]: The sun and the elements and all such things do not have bows, nor weapons, nor hands, nor limbs, nor members, nor resolutions of the soul. But Homer, very well educated in every kind of knowledge, says this on the basis of the symbolic Ethiopian characters[3]. For the Ethiopians do not have letters for their characters, but, instead, all kinds of living beings and their limbs and members. For since the more ancient of the sacred scribes wanted to conceal the theory about the nature of the gods[4], they handed these things down to their own children by way of such allegorical symbols[5] and characters[6], as the sacred scribe Chaeremon says. They wrote[7] (1) for 'joy', a woman beating a drum[8]; (2) for 'grief', a man holding his chin with his hand and bending down to the earth[9]; (3) for 'calamity', a weeping eye[10]; (4) for 'not-having', two empty hands stretched out[11]; (5) for 'the East' (or 'rising of the sun'), a snake coming out of a hole[12]; (6) for 'the West' (or 'setting of the sun'), (a snake) going into (a hole)[13]; (7) for 'return to life', a frog[14]; (8) for 'the soul', a falcon[15]; (9) the same sign also for 'sun' and 'god'[16]; (10) for '[a woman][17] who generates females' and for 'mother' and 'time' and 'heaven', a vulture[18]; (11) for 'king', a bee[19]; (12) for 'birth' and 'self-grown products' and 'males', a beetle[20]; (13) for 'earth', a bull[21]; (14) the front part of a lion means, according to them, all kinds of strength and custody[22]; (15) the tail of a lion (means) necessity[23]; (16) a deer (means) a year[24]; (17) a palmtree also (means a year)[25]; (18) a child means growing things[26]; (19) an old man (means) things passing away[27]; (20) a bow (means) passionate power[28]; (21) and innumerable other signs. On the basis of these things Homer says this. At another place, if you want, with the aid of Chaeremon I will speak also about the Ethiopian pronunciation of the characters themselves.

Fragm. 13: Tzetzes, *Chiliades* V 395-398

As Chaeremon, the Egyptian sacred scribe, demonstrated in his lessons about the sacred characters, the phoenix dies once in seven-thousand and six years, when it is in the districts of Egypt[1].

Fragm. 14: Apollonius Dyscolus, *De coniunctionibus* 6[1]

Further, there are also some who say that these (*sc.* expletive conjunctions) are wrongly called conjunctions, since they do not have the function of connecting sentences. But Chaeremon the Stoic says that in a sense they *are* conjunctions. "For", he says, "'conjunction' is said both of the word-form itself and of that which is meant by it, as is also the case with some other forms. We call a 'patronymic' both that which is patronymic

σχήματα. φαμέν [τι] πατρωνυμικὸν καὶ τὸ ἐν χαρακτῆρι πατρωνυμικὸν καὶ τὸ ἐν δηλουμένῳ, καὶ ἔτι τὰ κτητικά, καὶ ἄλλα πλεῖστα τοιαῦτα. ὡς οὖν τὸ τύπῳ πατρωνυμικῷ προσκεχρημένον, οὐ μὴν δηλουμένῳ, πατρωνυμικὸν καλεῖται, ὥσπερ τὰ τύπῳ ἀρσενικά, οὐ μὴν δηλουμένῳ, ἀρσενικὰ καλεῖται, οὕτω καί, ἂν τύπῳ ᾖ ὁ παραπληρωματικὸς κεχορηγημένος συνδεσμικῷ, μὴ μὴν δηλουμένῳ, εἰρήσεται σύνδεσμος. ἀμέλει αὐτοὶ οἱ σύνδεσμοι πλεονάσαντες οὐδὲν συνδέουσι καὶ σύνδεσμοι καλοῦνται. οὐδὲν οὖν κωλύοι, καθότι καὶ ὁ Φιλόπονος ἀπεφήνατο, συνδέσμους καλεῖσθαι τοὺς παραπληρωματικούς.» καὶ τοῦτό φησι δεδωκὼς ὅτι οὐδὲν συνδεσμικὸν δηλοῦσιν.

FRAGMENTA DUBIA

Fragm. 15D: Psellus, Ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου λόγου τοῦ περὶ Υἱοῦ, Parisinus Gr. 1182 fol. 227v (ed. J. Bidez, *Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs VI: Michel Psellus*, Bruxelles (Lamertin) 1928, pp. 163-164)

τὰ δὲ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων οὐ πάνυ σαφῶς (οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ τούτων ἀπεσπούδασα), ἀλλὰ πάντα συμβολικά· σφίγγες γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἴβιδες καί τινα περιφερῆ σχήματα ἐν ταμείοις ἀποκρυπτόμενα, καὶ ἄλλ' ἄττα, ὧν τὸ μὲν φαινόμενον οὐχ ὑπερβαίνει τὴν αἴσθησιν, ἐκεῖνοι δέ φασι διὰ τούτων εἰκονίζειν τὰ νοητά.

Fragm. 16D: Psellus, Ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου λόγου τοῦ περὶ Υἱοῦ, Parisinus Gr. 1182 fol. 277v (ed. Bidez, p. 164)

ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι ἀμαθεῖς τὰ πρῶτα τοῦ δαιμονίου καὶ ἐστασίαζον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· ἐπολιτεύοντο γὰρ κατὰ δήμους. Ὤανης δέ τις ἀνὴρ τὴν ἀμαθίαν αὐτῶν κατιδών, καταδραμὼν τοῦ ἐκείνων ἤθους ἐβασίλευσεν εὐφυῶς· περὶ γὰρ τὰς παρατηρήσεις ἐσχολακὼς τῶν ἐκλείψεων, ἐπειδὴ ἔγνω τὸν καιρὸν εἶναι τοῦ ἐκλελοιπέναι τὸν ἥλιον, δορὰν ἰχθύος ἀμφιασάμενος, φοιτᾷ πρὸς αὐτούς, παρὰ Ἑρμοῦ φήσας ἀπεστάλθαι τοῦ ἐκείνου πατρός· οἱ δ' ἰδόντες τὸ ἀλλόκοτον τῆς περιβολῆς ἔφριξαν. ὁ δέ, «ἥκω», φησί, «τῆς ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τοῦ θεοῦ μήνιδος μηνυτής· χολᾷ γὰρ ὑμῖν τὸ δαιμόνιον ὅτι μὴ ὑφ' ἡγεμόνι τέταχθε· κἂν μὴ μετασταίητε καὶ βασιλέα σφίσιν αὐτοῖς καταδέξησθε, ὁ μέγας ὑμῖν ἐπιλείψει φωστήρ». οἱ δ' ἀπιστήσαντες δεσμοῦσι τὸν ἄνδρα, ὡς, ἢν μὲν ὁ χόλος ἐπιγένηται, βασιλέα καταδεξόμενοι, ἢν δὲ μή, ἀποκτενοῦσιν εὐθύς. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπέδραμεν ἡ σελήνη τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τῶν ἀκτίνων ἀπεστερήθησαν, λύουσι μὲν αὐτίκα τῶν δεσμῶν τὸν Ὤανην, λιπαροῦσι δὲ ἐξευμενίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ δαιμόνιον. ὁ δὲ τερατευσάμενος τὴν ἴλεωσιν καὶ πιέσας τὰ χείλη ὥσπερ οἱ κάτοχοι, ὑπ' ὀδόντα δέ τινα θρυλλισμὸν ἠχήσας, αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο ἐβράβευσεν ὅπερ ἡ σελήνη παραδραμοῦσα τὸν ἥλιον ἐδωρήσατο. οὗτος αὐτοῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας ἐθεοποίησε καὶ τὸν

in form and that which is it in meaning[2]; and also the possessive adjectives[3] and very many other words of such a nature. Thus, just as that which has a patronymic form but not a (patronymic) meaning is called a patronymic, (and) just as formally masculine words which do not have a male meaning are called masculina, so also the expletive (conjunction), when it has the form of a conjunction but does not have such a meaning, may be called a conjunction. Actually, conjunctions themselves do not connect anything if they are pleonastic, but are yet called conjunctions[4]. So, as Philoponus[5] also asserted, there is nothing against calling the expletives conjunctions". And this he says while positing that they do not have a connective meaning[6].

Fragmenta Dubia

Fragm. 15D: Psellus, Ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου λόγου τοῦ περὶ Υἱοῦ, Paris. Gr. 1182 fol. 277v.

The point of view of the Egyptians (for I am interested in that too) is not wholly clear, but everything is symbolic. For they have sphinxes, and ibises, and some spherical forms stored away in treasuries, and some other things of which the outward appearance does not transcend sense-perception, but they claim that by means of these things they are copying the intelligible world[1].

Fragm. 16D: Psellus, Ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου λόγου τοῦ περὶ Υἱοῦ, Paris. Gr. 1182, fol. 277 v.[1]

Initially they (*sc.* the Egyptians) were ignorant of the divine and had strife against one another, for they had governments on a regional basis. But a man called Oanes, who noticed their ignorance, inveighed against this habit of theirs and cleverly became their king. He had devoted himself to the observation of eclipses, and when he knew that it was the time for an eclipse of the sun, he put on the skin of a fish and went to them and said that he had been sent to them by his father Hermes[2]. When they saw the strange form of his dress, they shuddered. But he said, "I have come to you to inform you about the wrath of the deity against you. For the god is angry with you because you have not placed yourselves under a leader. And if you do not change your mind and accept a king for yourself, the great light will fail for you". They did not believe the man and put him in chains, in order to accept him as king only if the wrath would manifest itself, or, if not, to kill him right away[3]. When the moon overran the sun and they were bereft of the sunbeams, they immediately released Oanes from prison, and they beseeched him to propitiate the deity for them. He procured the propitiation by a trick: he pressed his lips like the possessed, making an unclear sound with his teeth, and managed

οὐράνιον κόσμον, καί τινας φύσεις ἡλιακὰς καλουμένας καὶ σεληναίας ὑπέστησε.

Fragm. 17D : Porphyry, *De cultu simulacrorum* fragm. 10 (= Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* III 11, 45 - 13, 2, ed. Mras, vol. I, pp. 143-146; also in J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, Hildesheim (Olms) 1964, repr. of the 1913 ed., pp. 18*-23*)

11,45 τὸν δημιουργόν, ὃν Κνὴφ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι προσαγορεύουσιν, ἀνθρωποειδῆ, τὴν δὲ χροιὰν ἐκ κυανοῦ μέλανος ἔχοντα, κρατοῦντα ζωὴν καὶ σκῆπτρον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς πτερὸν βασίλειον περικείμενον, ὅτι λόγος δυσεύρετος καὶ ἐγκεκρυμμένος καὶ οὐ φανὸς καὶ ὅτι ζῳοποιὸς καὶ ὅτι βασιλεὺς καὶ
46 ὅτι νοερῶς κινεῖται· διὸ ἡ τοῦ πτεροῦ φύσις ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κεῖται. τὸν δὲ θεὸν τοῦτον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος προΐεσθαι ᾠόν φασιν, ἐξ οὗ γεννᾶσθαι θεόν, ὃν αὐτοὶ προσαγορεύουσι Φθᾶ, οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες Ἥφαιστον· ἑρμηνεύειν δὲ τὸ ᾠὸν τὸν κόσμον. ἀφιέρωται δὲ τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ πρόβατον διὰ τὸ τοὺς
47 παλαιοὺς γαλακτοποτεῖν. αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου τὸ δείκηλον τοιόνδε ἀνέπλασαν· ἀνθρωποειδές ἐστιν ἄγαλμα, τοὺς μὲν πόδας συμβεβηκότας ἔχον, ἄνωθεν δὲ μέχρι ποδῶν ποικίλον ἱμάτιον περιβεβλημένον· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς σφαῖραν ἔχει χρυσῆν διὰ τὸ μὴ μεταβαίνειν καὶ διὰ τὴν τῶν ἄστρων ποικίλην φύσιν καὶ ὅτι σφαιροειδὴς ὁ κόσμος.

48 Ἥλιον δὲ σημαίνουσιν ποτὲ μὲν δι' ἀνθρώπου ἐπιβεβηκότος πλοῖον, τοῦ πλοίου ἐπὶ κροκοδείλου κειμένου. δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ μὲν πλοῖον τὴν ἐν ὑγρῷ κίνησιν, ὁ δὲ κροκόδειλος πότιμον ὕδωρ, ἐν ᾧ φέρεται ὁ ἥλιος. ἐσημαίνετο τοίνυν ὁ ἥλιος δι' ἀέρος ὑγροῦ καὶ γλύκεος τὴν περιπόλησιν
49 ποιεῖσθαι. τῆς δὲ οὐρανίας γῆς καὶ τῆς χθονίας τὴν δύναμιν Ἶσιν προσεῖπον διὰ τὴν ἰσότητα, ἀφ' ἧς τὸ δίκαιον. οὐρανίαν δὲ τὴν σελήνην, χθονίαν δὲ [καὶ] τὴν καρποφόρον, ἐν ᾗ κατοικοῦμεν, λέγουσιν.

50 τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ δύναται Δημήτηρ παρ' Ἕλλησιν καὶ Ἶσις παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις, καὶ πάλιν Κόρη παρ' Ἕλλησι καὶ Διόνυσος καὶ Ἶσις καὶ Ὄσιρις παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις. αὕτη δὲ τρέφουσα καὶ αἴρουσα τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς· ὁ δὲ Ὄσιρις παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις τὴν κάρπιμον παρίστησι δύναμιν, ἣν θρήνοις ἀπομειλίσσονται εἰς γῆν ἀφανιζομένην ἐν τῷ σπόρῳ καὶ ὑφ' ἡμῶν καταναλισκομένην
51 εἰς τροφάς. λαμβάνεται δὲ καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς ποταμίας τοῦ Νείλου δυνάμεως· ἀλλ' ὅταν μὲν τὴν χθονίαν γῆν σημαίνωσιν, Ὄσιρις ἡ κάρπιμος λαμβάνεται δύναμις, ὅταν δὲ τὴν οὐρανίαν, Ὄσιρίς ἐστιν ὁ Νεῖλος, ὃν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ

to obtain precisely that with which the moon, having passed the sun, presented them. He also deified for them the stars and the rest of the heavenly world and introduced some so-called sunlike and moonlike natures.

Fragm. 17D: Porphyry, *De cultu simulacrorum* fr. 10[1]

The demiurge, whom the Egyptians call Kneph[2], is of human form, but with a skin of dark blue, holding 'life'[3] and a sceptre, bearing a royal feather on his head, because reason is hard to find, and hidden, and not conspicuous, and because it is life-giving, and because it is king, and because it moves in an intellectual way — that is why the feather has been put upon his head[4].

They say that this god put forth from his mouth an egg, from which was born a god whom they themselves call Phtha, but the Greeks Hephaestus. And the egg they interpreted as the world[5]. To this god a sheep is consecrated, because the ancients used to drink milk.

Of the universe itself they made a representation such as this: it is an anthropomorphic statue, which has its feet placed together, is clothed from head to foot with a many-coloured robe, and has on its head a golden sphere — the first because of its immobility, the second because of the many-coloured nature of the stars, and the third because the world is spherical[6].

They symbolize the sun by a man embarked on a ship which is set upon a crocodile[7]. The ship indicates the sun's movement in a liquid element, the crocodile the potable water in which the sun moves. Thus they symbolize that the sun accomplishes his revolution through air that is liquid and sweet[8].

The power of the earth, both the celestial and the terrestrial earth, they called Isis because of the equality (*isotes*) which is the source of justice. They say that the celestial earth is the moon, and the terrestrial the fruitful earth on which we live[9].

Demeter has the same power among the Greeks as Isis among the Egyptians, and also Kore and Dionysus among the Greeks the same power as Isis * and Osiris among the Egyptians. It is she (Isis) who nourishes and raises up the fruits of the earth, and Osiris represents among the Egyptians the fertilizing power, which they propitiate by lamentations when it disappears into the earth in the process of sowing and when it is consumed by us for food[10].

He (Osiris) is also taken to be the river-power of the Nile[11], but when they symbolize the terrestrial earth, Osiris is taken to be the fertilizing power. When, however, (they symbolize) the celestial (earth), Osiris is the Nile, which they believe to come down from heaven[12]. They bewail him also,

καταφέρεσθαι οἴονται· πενθοῦσι δὲ καὶ τοῦτον, ἀπομειλισσόμενοι τὴν δύναμιν λήγουσαν καὶ ἀναλισκομένην. ἡ δὲ ἐν τοῖς μύθοις μισγομένη τῷ Ὀσίριδι Ἶσις ἡ Αἰγυπτία ἐστὶ γῆ, διόπερ ἰσοῦται καὶ κυεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ τοὺς καρπούς· διὸ ἀνὴρ τῆς Ἴσιδος Ὄσιρις καὶ ἀδελφὸς καὶ υἱὸς παραδέδοται.

12,1 κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἐλεφαντίνην πόλιν τετίμηται ἄγαλμα, πεπλασμένον μέν ἄλλα ἀνδρείκελον καὶ καθήμενον κυανοῦν τε τὴν χρόαν, κεφαλὴν δὲ κριοῦ κεκτημένον καὶ βασίλειον κέρατα τράγεια ἔχον, οἷς ἔπεστι κύκλος δισκοειδής. κάθηται δὲ παρακειμένου κεραμέου ἀγγείου, ἐφ᾽ οὗ ἄνθρωπον ἀναπλάσσει. δηλοῖ δὲ ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ κριοῦ πρόσωπον ἔχειν καὶ αἰγὸς κέρατα τὴν ἐν κριῷ σύνοδον ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης· τὸ δὲ ἐκ κυανοῦ χρῶμα, ὅτι ὑδραγωγὸς ἐν συνόδῳ ἡ σελήνη.

2 τὸ δὲ δεύτερον φῶς τῆς σελήνης ἐν Ἀπόλλωνος μὲν πόλει καθιέρωται· ἔστι δὲ τούτου σύμβολον ἱερακοπρόσωπος ἄνθρωπος ζιβύνῃ χειρούμενος Τυφῶνα ἱπποποτάμῳ εἰκασμένον. λευκὸν δὲ τῇ χρόᾳ τὸ ἄγαλμα, τῆς μὲν λευκότητος τὸ φωτίζεσθαι τὴν σελήνην παραστησάσης, τοῦ δὲ ἱερακείου προσώπου τὸ ἀφ᾽ ἡλίου φωτίζεσθαι καὶ πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν. τὸν γὰρ ἱέρακα ἡλίῳ ἀφιεροῦσιν· φωτὸς δὲ καὶ πνεύματος ἱέραξ αὐτοῖς σύμβολον διά τε τὴν ὀξυκινησίαν καὶ τὸ πρὸς ὕψος ἀνατρέχειν, ἔνθα τὸ φῶς· ὁ δ᾽ ἱπποπόταμος τὸν δυτικὸν δηλοῖ πόλον, παρὰ τὸ καταπίνειν εἰς ἑαυτὸν τοὺς περιπολοῦντας. θεὸς δὲ τιμᾶται ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ ὁ Ὧρος.

3 ἡ δὲ τῆς Εἰλειθυίας πόλις τὸ τρίτον φῶς θεραπεύει· τὸ δὲ ξόανον τετύπωται εἰς γῦπα πετομένην, ἧς τὸ πτέρωμα ἐκ σπουδαίων συνέστηκε λίθων. σημαίνει δὲ τὸ μὲν γυποειδὲς αὐτῆς τὴν γεννητικὴν πνευμάτων σελήνην· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πνεύματος οἴονται συλλαμβάνειν τὸν γῦπα, θηλείας πάσας ἀποφαινόμενοι.

4 ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατ᾽ Ἐλευσῖνα μυστηρίοις ὁ μὲν ἱεροφάντης εἰς εἰκόνα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ ἐνσκευάζεται, δᾳδοῦχος δὲ εἰς τὴν ἡλίου· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ βωμῷ εἰς τὴν σελήνης, ὁ δὲ ἱεροκῆρυξ Ἑρμοῦ.

5 καὶ ἄνθρωπος δὲ παρ᾽ Αἰγυπτίοις ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς παρείληπται. Ἄναβις γάρ ἐστι κώμη Αἰγύπτου, ἐν ᾗ θεραπεύεται ἄνθρωπος καὶ θύεται τούτῳ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν τὰ ἱερεῖα καίεται· ὁ δὲ μετ᾽ ὀλίγον φάγοι ἂν τὰ ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ αὐτῷ παρεσκευασμένα.

6 ὅτι δὲ οὐδὲ τὰ ζῷα θεοὺς ἡγοῦνται, εἰκόνας δὲ ἐποιοῦντο καὶ σύμβολα ταῦτα θεῶν, δηλοῖ τὸ πολλαχοῦ βοῦς ἀναχθέντας θεοῖς ἐν ταῖς ἱερομηνίαις καὶ ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς θρησκείαις βουθυτεῖν. ἡλίῳ μὲν γὰρ καὶ σελήνῃ βοῦς ἀνιέρωσαν.

13,1 ἀλλ᾽ ὅ γε ἡλίῳ ἀνακείμενος ἐν Ἡλίου πόλει καλούμενος Μνεῦις βοῶν ἐστι μέγιστος, σφόδρα μέλας, μάλιστα ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ὁ πολὺς μελαίνει τὰ ἀνθρώπεια σώματα. ἔχει δὲ τὴν οὐρὰν παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους βοῦς καὶ τὸ

to propitiate the power when it abates and is consumed. The Isis who, in the myths, has intercourse with Osiris is the land of Egypt; therefore she becomes his equal, and conceives, and produces the fruits. Hence, in the tradition, Osiris, Isis' husband, is also her brother and her son[13].

In the city of Elephantine is honoured an image which is formed in all other respects like a man[14], sitting, and of a blue colour, but with a ram's head and a diadem having the horns of a goat above which is a disk-shaped circle. He sits with a vessel of clay beside him on which he is moulding a man[15]. By his having the face of a ram and the horns of a goat[16], he indicates the conjunction of sun and moon in the sign of the Ram. The blue colour (indicates) that in this conjunction the moon brings rain.

The second phase of the moon is worshipped in Apollinopolis, and its symbol is a man with the face of a falcon subduing with a spear Typhon in the form of a hippopotamus. The image has a white colour, the whiteness representing the brightness of the moon, and the face of the falcon (representing) the fact that it receives light and breath from the sun. For they consecrate the falcon to the sun. The falcon is for them the symbol of light and breath because of its rapidity and its soaring up on high, where the light is. And the hippopotamus represents the western sky because of its swallowing up into itself the stars that pass by. The god which is honoured in this city is Horus[17].

Eileithyaspolis worships the third phase (of the moon). The statue has the form of a flying vulture, whose plumage consists of precious stones[18]. Its likeness to a vulture signifies the moon as generative of the winds. For they believe that the vulture conceives from the wind, declaring them all to be females[19].

In the mysteries of Eleusis the hierophant is dressed up in the image of the demiurge, the torch-bearer in that of the sun, the priest at the altar in that of the moon, and the sacred herald in that of Hermes[20].

A man, too, is admitted by the Egyptians among their objects of worship. For Anabis is a village in Egypt in which a man is worshipped, and one sacrifices to him, and the victims are burned upon the altars. And after a little while he may eat the things that have been prepared for him as for a man[21].

But that they do not believe the animals to be gods but made them the images and symbols of the gods[22] is apparent from the fact that in many places they bring up bulls for the gods at their festivals in the sacred months and in their religious services and sacrifice them. For they consecrated bulls to the sun and the moon[23].

But the bull called Mnevis, which is dedicated to the sun in Heliopolis, is the largest of bulls, and is very black, chiefly because much sunshine

πᾶν σῶμα ἀνάτριχον, καθάπερ ὁ ἥλιος τὸν ἐναντίον τῷ πόλῳ ποιεῖται δρόμον· τούς τε ὄρχεις μεγίστους, ἐπειδήπερ ὁ περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια ἵμερος γίνεται ὑπὸ θερμότητος ὅ τε ἥλιος σπερμαίνειν λέγεται τὴν φύσιν.
2 σελήνῃ δὲ ταῦρον ἀνέθεσαν, ὃν Απιν ἐπονομάζουσιν, μέλανα μὲν καὶ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους, φέροντα δὲ σημεῖα ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης, ὅτι καὶ τῆς σελήνης τὸ φῶς ἐξ ἡλίου· ἡλίου δὲ σημεῖον τὸ μέλαν τοῦ σώματος καὶ ὁ ὑπὸ τὴν γλῶτταν κάνθαρος· σελήνης δὲ σύμβολον τό τε διχότομον καὶ ἀμφίκυρτον.

Fragm. 18D : Suda *s.v.* Πρίαπος (ed. A. Adler, vol. IV, Stuttgart (Teubner) 1935, repr. 1971, p. 194)

Πρίαπος : τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Πριάπου τοῦ Ὥρου παρ᾽ Αἰγυπτίοις κεκλημένου ἀνθρωποειδὲς ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ σκῆπτρον κατέχον, ὡσανεὶ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ φανεῖσαν τὴν ξηρὰν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν· ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐωνύμῳ κρατοῦν τὸ αἰδοῖον αὐτοῦ ἐντεταμένον, διότι τὰ κεκρυμμένα ἐν τῇ γῇ σπέρματα φανερὰ καθίστησι. τὰ δὲ πτερὰ τὴν ταχυτῆτα τῆς κινήσεως· τὸν δὲ κύκλον τοῦ δίσκου τὴν περιφέρειαν· ταὐτὸν γὰρ τῷ ἡλίῳ δοξάζουσι.

Fragm. 19D : Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* V 7, 41,2-43,2 (edd. O. Stählin - L. Früchtel, Griech. christl. Schriftst. 12, Clemens Alex. 2, Berlin (Akademie Verlag) 1960, pp. 354-355)

41,2 ὅμοια γοῦν τοῖς Ἑβραϊκοῖς κατά γε τὴν ἐπίκρυψιν καὶ τὰ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων αἰνίγματα. Αἰγυπτίων οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ πλοίου, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ κροκοδείλου τὸν ἥλιον
3 δεικνύουσι. σημαίνουσι δὲ ὅτι ὁ ἥλιος, δι᾽ ἀέρος γλυκεροῦ καὶ ὑγροῦ τὴν πορείαν ποιούμενος, γεννᾷ τὸν χρόνον, ὃν αἰνίσσεται ὁ κροκόδειλος
4 διά τινα ἄλλην ἱερατικὴν ἱστορίαν. ναὶ μὴν καὶ ἐν Διοσπόλει τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ καλουμένου πυλῶνος διατετύπωται παιδίον μὲν γενέσεως σύμβολον, φθορᾶς δὲ ὁ γέρων, θεοῦ τε αὖ ὁ ἱέραξ, ὡς ὁ ἰχθὺς μίσους,
42,1 καὶ κατ᾽ ἄλλο πάλιν σημαινόμενον ὁ κροκόδειλος ἀναιδείας. φαίνεται τοίνυν συντιθέμενον τὸ πᾶν σύμβολον δηλωτικὸν εἶναι τοῦδε· «ᾧ γινόμενοι καὶ
2 ἀπογινόμενοι, θεὸς μισεῖ ἀναίδειαν.» τά τε ὦτα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς οἱ δημιουργοῦντες ἐξ ὕλης τιμίας καθιεροῦσιν τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνατιθέντες εἰς τοὺς νεώς, τοῦτο δήπου αἰνισσόμενοι ὡς πάντα θεὸς ὁρᾷ καὶ ἀκούει.
3 πρὸς τοῖσδε ἀλκῆς μὲν καὶ ῥώμης σύμβολον αὐτοῖς ὁ λέων· ὥσπερ ἀμέλει γῆς τε αὐτῆς καὶ γεωργίας καὶ τροφῆς ὁ βοῦς, ἀνδρείας τε καὶ παρρησίας ὁ ἵππος, ἀλκῆς τε αὖ μετὰ συνέσεως ἡ σφίγξ, τὸ μὲν σῶμα πᾶν λέοντος,
4 τὸ πρόσωπον δὲ ἀνθρώπου ἔχουσα. ὁμοίως τε τούτοις σύνεσιν καὶ μνήμην καὶ κράτος καὶ τέχνην ὁ ἄνθρωπος αἰνισσόμενος τοῖς ἱεροῖς πρὸς αὐτῶν
43,1 ἐγγλύφεται. ἤδη δὲ κἀν ταῖς καλουμέναις παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς κωμασίαις τῶν θεῶν χρυσᾶ ἀγάλματα, δύο μὲν κύνας, ἕνα δὲ ἱέρακα καὶ ἶβιν μίαν περιφέρουσι
2 καὶ καλοῦσι τὰ τέσσαρα τῶν ἀγαλμάτων εἴδωλα τέσσαρα γράμματα. εἰσὶ

blackens men's bodies. In contrast to other bulls, its tail and the rest of its body are covered with hair that bristles backwards, just as the sun makes its course in the opposite direction to the heaven. It has very big testicles because sexual desire is produced by heat and the sun is said to fertilize nature[24].

To the moon they dedicated a bull which they call Apis, which also is blacker than others, bearing symbols of sun and moon because the light of the moon also comes from the sun. The symbol of the sun is the blackness of its body and the beetle-mark under its tongue. The symbol of the moon is its half moon and gibbous form[25].

Fragm. 18D: Suda *s.v.* Priapus[1]

Priapus: the statue of Priapus, who is called Horus among the Egyptians[2], is made in human form, holding fast a sceptre[3] in his right hand as if the dry land and the sea appear through him[4]. In his left hand he holds his penis in erection[5] because he makes visible the seeds that lie hidden in the earth. The feathers (symbolize) the speed of his motion; the circle of the disk (symbolizes) his revolution. For they identify him with the sun[6].

Fragm. 19D: Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* V 7, 41,2-43,2[1]

The enigmas of the Egyptians are then, as far as their concealing function is concerned, similar to those of the Hebrews. Some of the Egyptians depict the sun on a boat, others on a crocodile[2]. They signify hereby that the sun, travelling through sweet and moist air, generates time, which is symbolized by the crocodile according to another priestly tradition. Further, at Diospolis in Egypt, on the pylon called The Sacred[3], there is represented a child as a symbol of birth and an old man as that of decay[4]. Further, the symbol * of god is a falcon[5], as the fish is of hatred[6], and, according to a different symbolism, the crocodile that of shamelessness[7]. The whole symbol, then, when put together, appears to teach this: "Oh, you who are born and die, god hates shamelessness"[8]. And there are those who fabricate ears and eyes of precious material and consecrate them to the gods by placing them in the temples, thereby indicating, of course, that god sees and hears all things[9]. In addition to these, the lion is for them the symbol of strength and might, as the bull, of course, is of the earth itself and of agriculture and of food, and the horse of courage and confidence, and the sphinx, on the other hand, of strength combined with intelligence, as it has a body entirely that of a lion but the face of a man. Similarly, to symbolize intelligence, memory, power, and art, a man is carved by them in the temples[10]

Finally, in the festival which they call *Comasiae*[11], they carry about golden statues of the gods — two dogs, one falcon, and one ibis — and

γοῦν οἱ μὲν κύνες σύμβολα τῶν δυεῖν ἡμισφαιρίων, οἷον περιπολούντων καὶ φυλασσόντων· ὁ δὲ ἱέραξ ἡλίου· πυρώδης γὰρ καὶ ἀναιρετικός· αὐτίκα τὰς λοιμικὰς νόσους ἡλίῳ ἀνατιθέασιν· ἡ δὲ ἶβις σελήνης, τὰ μὲν σκιερὰ τῷ μέλανι, τὰ δὲ φωτεινὰ τῷ λευκῷ τῶν πτίλων εἰκαζόντων.

Fragm. 20D: Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* V 4, 20,3-21,3 (edd. O. Stählin - L. Früchtel pp. 339-340)

20,3 αὐτίκα οἱ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις παιδευόμενοι πρῶτον μὲν πάντων τὴν Αἰγυπτίων γραμμάτων μέθοδον ἐκμανθάνουσι τὴν ἐπιστολογραφικὴν καλουμένην· δευτέραν δὲ τὴν ἱερατικήν, ᾗ χρῶνται οἱ ἱερογραμματεῖς· ὑστάτην δὲ καὶ τελευταίαν τὴν ἱερογληφικήν, ἧς ἡ μέν ἐστι διὰ τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων κυριολογική, ἡ δὲ συμβολική. τῆς δὲ συμβολικῆς ἡ μὲν κυριολογεῖται κατὰ μίμησιν, ἡ δ' ὥσπερ τροπικῶς γράφεται, ἡ δὲ ἄντικρυς ἀλληγορεῖται κατά τινας αἰνιγμούς.

4 Ἥλιον γοῦν γράψαι βουλόμενοι κύκλον ποιοῦσι, σελήνην δὲ σχῆμα
5 μηνοειδὲς κατὰ τὸ κυριολογούμενον εἶδος. τροπικῶς δὲ κατ' οἰκειότητα μετάγοντες καὶ μετατιθέντες, τὰ δ' ἐξαλλάττοντες, τὰ δὲ πολλαχῶς
21,1 μετασχηματίζοντες χαράττουσιν. τοὺς γοῦν τῶν βασιλέων ἐπαίνους, θεολογουμένοις μύθοις παραδιδόντες, ἀναγράφουσι διὰ τῶν ἀναγλύφων.
2 τοῦ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς αἰνιγμοὺς τρίτου εἴδους δεῖγμα ἔστω τόδε· τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ἄστρων διὰ τὴν πορείαν τὴν λοξὴν ὄφεων σώμασιν ἀπείκαζον, τὸν δὲ ἥλιον τῷ τοῦ κανθάρου, ἐπειδὴ κυκλοτερὲς ἐκ τῆς
3 βοείας ὄνθου σχῆμα πλασάμενος ἀντιπρόσωπος κυλίνδει. φασὶ δὲ καὶ ἑξάμηνον μὲν ὑπὸ γῆς, θάτερον δὲ τοῦ ἔτους τμῆμα τὸ ζῷον τοῦτο ὑπὲρ γῆς διαιτᾶσθαι σπερμαίνειν τε εἰς τὴν σφαῖραν καὶ γεννᾶν καὶ θῆλυν κάνθαρον μὴ γίνεσθαι.

Fragm. 21D: Porphyry, *De Abstinentia* IV 9 (edd. Bouffartigue-Patillon, Budé)

ὅθεν καὶ ὁ λέων ὡς θεὸς θρησκεύεται καὶ μέρος τι τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ὃ καλοῦσι νομόν, ἐπώνυμον ἔχει Λεοντοπολίτην, ἄλλο δὲ Βουσειρίτην, ἄλλο δὲ Κυνοπολίτην, καὶ ἄλλο Λυκοπολίτην. τὴν γὰρ ἐπὶ πάντα δύναμιν τοῦ θείου διὰ τῶν συννόμων ζῴων ὧν ἕκαστος τῶν θεῶν παρέσχεν ἐθρήσκευσαν.

they call the four images of these statues four letters. The dogs, namely, are symbols of the two hemispheres, which, as it were, go round and watch; the falcon (is a symbol) of the sun, for it is fiery and destructive (for example, they attribute pestilent diseases to the sun); and the ibis (is a symbol) of the moon because they compare the shady parts with its black feathers, and the shining parts with its white feathers[12].

Fragm. 20D: Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* V 4, 20,3 - 21,3[1]

Those instructed among the Egyptians learn first of all the genre of Egyptian letters which is called 'epistolographic'; secondly, the 'hieratic' genre which is used by the sacred scribes; finally and in the last place, the 'hieroglyphic' genre[2], which partly expresses things literally by means of primary letters[3] and which is partly symbolical[4]. In the symbolical method, one kind speaks 'literally' by imitation, a second kind writes as it were metaphorically, and a third one is outright allegorical by means of certain enigmas.

So when they want to write the word "sun" they make a circle, and for the word "moon" (they draw) a crescent-shaped figure according to the literal genre[5]. But in the metaphorical genre they change and alter the sense on the basis of an affinity, writing some signs by substituting them for other signs and others by modifying them in many ways. (21) The praises of the kings, therefore, which they transmit in religious myths, are inscribed by them in bas-reliefs[6]. Let the following serve as a specimen of the third kind, which uses enigmas: the rest of the stars they represented by bodies of serpents because of their oblique course; the sun, however, by the body of a beetle because it makes a round shape from ox-dung and rolls it before its face[7]. They also say that this animal lives six months under ground and the other part of the year above ground, and emits its seed into the ball and brings forth; and that there are no female beetles[8].

Fragm. 21D: Porphyry, *De abstinentia* IV 9 (= Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* III 4, 8 - 14)[1]

Hence also the lion is worshipped as a god[2], and one district of Egypt, which they call a 'nome', has (from the lion) the name Leontopolite (nome), another (from the cow) the name Bousirite (nome), another (from * the dog) the name Cynopolite (nome), and another (from the wolf) the name Lycopolite (nome). For the divine power which is extended over all things they worshipped through the district animals which each of the gods had given them[3] ...

They even worship a man in the village Anabis, where they sacrifice and burn the victims for him on the altars; and he may eat, shortly afterwards, the things appropriate to him that have been prepared for him as a man.

... καὶ ἄνθρωπον σέβουσιν κατὰ Ἄναβιν κώμην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τούτῳ θύεται καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν τὰ ἱερεῖα κάεται· ὁ δὲ μετ' ὀλίγον φάγοι ἂν τὰ ἴδια αὐτῷ ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ παρεσκευασμένα. ὡς οὖν ἀνθρώπου ἀφεκτέον, οὕτω καὶ τῶν ἄλλων. ἔτι δ' ἐκ περιττῆς σοφίας καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον συντροφίας κατέλαβόν τισι τῶν θεῶν προσφιλῆ τῶν ζῴων τινὰ μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἡλίῳ ἱέρακα, σύμπασαν μὲν τὴν φύσιν ἐξ αἵματος ἔχοντα καὶ πνεύματος, οἰκτείροντα δὲ καὶ ἄνθρωπον καὶ κωκύοντα ἐπὶ νεκρῷ κειμένῳ γῆν τε ἐπαμώμενον εἰς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐν οἷς τὸ ἡλιακὸν κατοικεῖν πεπιστεύκασι φῶς, καὶ ζῆν μὲν ἐπὶ πλείονα ἔτη κατειληφότες, μετὰ δὲ τὸν βίον ἰσχὺν ἔχειν μαντικὴν καὶ εἶναι λογικώτατον ἀπολυθέντα τοῦ σώματος καὶ προγνωστικώτατον, τελεῖν τε ἀγάλματα καὶ ναοὺς κινεῖν. κάνθαρον δὲ ἀμαθὴς ⟨μὲν⟩ βδελυχθείη ἂν ἀγνώμων ὑπάρχων τῶν θείων, Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ ἐσέφθησαν ὡς εἰκόνα Ἡλίου ἔμψυχον. κάνθαρος γὰρ πᾶς ἄρρην καὶ ἀφιεὶς τὸν θορὸν ἐν τέλματι καὶ ποιήσας σφαιροειδῆ τοῖς ὀπισθίοις ἀνταναφέρει ποσὶν ὡς ἥλιος κατ' οὐρανόν, καὶ περίοδον ἡμερῶν ἐκδέχεται εἰκοσιοκτὼ σεληνιακήν. οὕτως δὲ καὶ περὶ κριοῦ τι φιλοσοφοῦσιν καὶ ἄλλο τι περὶ κροκοδείλου περί τε γυπὸς καὶ ἴβεως καὶ ὅλως καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν ζῴων ὡς ἐκ φρονήσεως καὶ τῆς ἄγαν θεοσοφίας ἐπὶ τὸ σέβας ἐλθεῖν καὶ τῶν ζῴων.

Fragm. 22D: Porphyry, *De Abstinentia* II 47 (edd. Bouffartigue-Patillon, Budé)

ὅθεν ὀρθῶς οἱ θεολόγοι τῆς ἀποχῆς ἐπεμέλοντο, καὶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ταῦθ' ἡμῖν ἐμήνυσεν αἰτίαν ἀποδιδοὺς φυσικωτάτην, ἣν ἐκ τῆς πείρας ἐδοκίμασεν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ψυχὴ φαύλη καὶ ἄλογος, ἣ τὸ σῶμα ἀπέλειπε βίᾳ συληθεῖσα, προσμένει τούτῳ, ὅπου γε καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ τῶν βίᾳ ἀποθανόντων κατέχονται πρὸς τῷ σώματι, ὃ καὶ τοῦ μὴ βίᾳ ἑαυτὸν ἐξάγειν ἦν κωλυτικόν· ἐπεὶ οὖν τῶν ζῴων αἱ βίαιοι σφαγαὶ ἐμφιληδεῖν τὰς ψυχὰς οἷς ἀπολείπουσιν ἀναγκάζουσιν, διείργεται δὲ οὐδαμῶς ψυχὴ ἐκεῖ εἶναι ὅπου τὸ συγγενὲς καθέλκει αὐτήν, ὅθεν καὶ ὀδυρόμεναι ὤφθησαν πολλαί, καὶ αἱ τῶν ἀτάφων παραμένουσι τοῖς σώμασιν, αἷς καὶ οἱ γόητες καταχρῶνται πρὸς ⟨τὴν⟩ αὐτῶν ὑπηρεσίαν, βιαζόμενοι τῇ τοῦ σώματος ἢ μέρους τοῦ σώματος κατοχῇ· ἐπεὶ οὖν ταῦτα ἱστόρησαν καὶ φύσιν ψυχῆς φαύλης καὶ συγγένειαν καὶ ἡδονήν, ⟨ἣν⟩ ἔχει πρὸς τὰ σώματα ἐξ ὧν ἀπεσπάσθη, εἰκότως ἐφυλάξαντο τὴν τῶν σαρκῶν θοίνην ...

Fragm. 23D: Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* II 7 (ed. E. Bickel, *Diatribe in Senecae philosophi fragmenta* I, Leipzig (Teubner) 1915, pp. 403-404)

coge Aegyptium, ut ovium lacte vescatur; inpelle, si vales, Pelusioten, ut manducat cepam. singulae paene in Aegypto civitates singulas bestias et monstra venerantur et quodcumque coluerint, hoc inviolabile et sacrum

So, as one should abstain from eating man's flesh, one should abstain also from the meat of other beings[4].

Further, by their abundant wisdom and their familiarity with the divine they have understood that to some of the gods some animals are more dear than men; for instance, to the sun the falcon, whose whole nature consists of blood and breath, who feels pity even for man and shrieks over an exposed corpse and scrapes earth over his eyes, in which (eyes) according to their belief the light of the sun dwells[5]. They also hold that it lives for very many years, and that after its life it has mantic power and, once free from the body, is very intellectual and prescient, and that it even succeeds in moving statues and temples[6].

A beetle might be detested by an ignorant person who has no knowledge of things divine, but the Egyptians reverenced it as the living image of the sun. For every beetle is male, and it deposits its sperma in mud, and having made it into a ball it lifts it up with its hind feet, as the sun in heaven, and waits a lunar period of 28 days[7].

In like manner they make some philosophic explanation concerning the ram and others concerning the crocodile, the vulture, the ibis, and generally concerning each of the animals, for it was on the basis of their wisdom and their profound theosophy that they came to the worship even of animals.

Fragm. 22D: Porphyry, *De abstinentia* II 47[1]

Theologians have rightly paid attention to abstinence, and the Egyptian informs us of these things, giving a most natural reason for them which he verified by experience. For since a bad and irrational soul which tried to depart the body after having been detached from it by violence yet stays near to it (because the souls of men who die by violence also keep themselves near to the body — a fact which should prevent one from committing suicide) — since, then, violent slaughter of animals compels souls to delight in the bodies which they leave, the soul is by no means prevented from being in the place to which it is attracted by its kindred. Hence many souls are seen to lament and the souls of the unburied adhere to the bodies, souls which are abused by sorcerers for their own service, pressing them by retaining the body or part of it. Since, therefore, they (*sc.* the theologians) examined these things and the nature of a bad soul and its relationship to and pleasure in the bodies from which it was torn away, they rightly avoided feeding upon meat.

Fragm. 23D: Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* II 7[1]

Compel an Egyptian to consume milk of a sheep[2]; if you have the power to do so, impel an inhabitant of Pelusium to eat an onion[3]. Almost every city in Egypt worships its own animals and monsters, and whatever they revere is regarded by them as inviolable and sacred. Hence, their cities

putant. unde et urbes quoque aput eos ex animalium vocabulis nuncupantur : Leonto, Cyno, Lyco, Busiris, Thmuis quod interpretatur 'hircus'.

Fragm. 24D : Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* II 8 (ed. Bickel, pp. 405-406)

odoris autem suavitas et diversa thymiamata et amomum et cyfi, oenanthe, muscus et peregrini muris pellicula, quod dissolutis et amatoribus conveniat, nemo nisi dissolutus negat.

Fragm. 25D : Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica* (ed. F. Sbordone, Naples (Loffredo) 1940)

a) I 3 (p. 8 Sbordone) : ἐνιαυτὸν γράφοντες φοίνικα ζωγραφοῦσι.

b) I 6 (p. 12-13 Sb.) : θεὸν βουλόμενοι σημῆναι ... ἱέρακα ζωγραφοῦσι ... διὰ τὸ πολύγονον εἶναι τὸ ζῷον καὶ πολυχρόνιον. ἔτι γε μήν, ἐπεὶ καὶ δοκεῖ εἴδωλον ἡλίου ὑπάρχειν, παρὰ πάντα τὰ πετεινὰ πρὸς τὰς αὐτοῦ ἀκτῖνας ὀξυωποῦν, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἰατροὶ πρὸς ἴασιν ὀφθαλμῶν τῇ ἱερακίᾳ βοτάνῃ χρῶνται, ὅθεν καὶ τὸν ἥλιον, ὡς κύριον ὄντα ὁράσεως, ἔσθ' ὅτε ἱερακόμορφον ζωγραφοῦσιν.

c) I 7 (p. 14 Sb.) : ἔτι γε μὴν καὶ ἀντὶ ψυχῆς ὁ ἱέραξ τάσσεται.

d) I 10 (pp. 19-23 Sb.) : μονογενὲς δὲ δηλοῦντες, ἢ γένεσιν, ἢ πατέρα, ἢ κόσμον, ἢ ἄνδρα, κάνθαρον ζωγραφοῦσι. μογογενὲς μὲν ὅτι αὐτογενές ἐστι τὸ ζῷον, ὑπὸ θηλείας μὴ κυοφορούμενον. μόνη γὰρ γένεσις αὐτοῦ τοιαύτη ἐστίν· ἐπειδὰν ὁ ἄρσην βούληται παιδοποιήσασθαι, βοὸς ἀφόδευμα λαβών, πλάσσει σφαιροειδὲς παραπλήσιον τῷ κόσμῳ σχῆμα, ὃ ἐκ τῶν ὀπισθίων μερῶν κυλίσας ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς εἰς δύσιν, αὐτὸς πρὸς ἀνατολὴν βλέπει, ἵνα ἀποδῷ τὸ τοῦ κόσμου σχῆμα· (αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπηλιώτου εἰς λίβα φέρεται, ὁ δὲ τῶν ἀστέρων δρόμος ἀπὸ λιβὸς εἰς ἀπηλιώτην). ταύτην οὖν τὴν σφαῖραν κατορύξας, εἰς γῆν κατατίθεται ἐπὶ ἡμέρας εἰκοσιοκτώ, ἐν ὅσαις καὶ ἡ σελήνη ἡμέραις τὰ δώδεκα ζῴδια κυκλεύει, ὑφ' ἣν ἀπομένον, ζωογονεῖται τὸ τῶν κανθάρων γένος· τῇ ἐνάτῃ δὲ καὶ εἰκοστῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνοίξας τὴν σφαῖραν εἰς ὕδωρ βάλλει, (ταύτην γὰρ τὴν ἡμέραν νομίζει σύνοδον εἶναι σελήνης καὶ ἡλίου, ἔτι δὲ καὶ γένεσιν κόσμου), ἧς ἀνοιγομένης ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, ζῷα ἐξέρχεται, τουτέστιν οἱ κάνθαροι. γένεσιν δὲ διὰ τὴν προειρημένην αἰτίαν· πατέρα δέ, ὅτι ἐκ μόνου πατρὸς τὴν γένεσιν ἔχει ὁ κάνθαρος· κόσμον δέ, ἐπειδὴ κοσμοειδῆ τὴν γένεσιν ποιεῖται· ἄνδρα δέ, ἐπειδὴ θηλυκὸν γένος αὐτοῖς οὐ γίνεται.

e) I 11 (pp. 26-33 Sb.) : μητέρα δὲ γράφοντες, ἢ βλέψιν, ἢ ὅριον, ἢ πρόγνωσιν, ἢ ἐνιαυτόν, ἢ οὐρανίαν, ἢ ἐλεήμονα, ἢ Ἀθηνᾶν, ἢ Ἥραν, ἢ δραχμὰς δύο, γῦπα ζωγραφοῦσι. μητέρα μέν, ἐπειδὴ ἄρρεν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ γένει τῶν ζῴων οὐχ ὑπάρχει, ἡ δὲ γένεσις αὐτῶν γίνεται τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· ὅταν ὀργάσῃ πρὸς σύλληψιν ἡ γύψ, τὴν φύσιν ἑαυτῆς ἀνοίξασα πρὸς βορέαν ἄνεμον, ὑπὸ τούτου ὀχεύεται ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πέντε, ἐν αἷς οὔτε βρωτοῦ οὔτε ποτοῦ μεταλαμβάνει, ποθοῦσα παιδοποιΐαν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα γένη ὀρνέων, ἃ ὑπὸ ἀνέμου συλλαμβάνει, ὧν τὰ ᾠὰ πρὸς βρῶσιν αὐτὸ μόνον,

are also called by names of animals: Leonto, Cyno, Lyco, Busiris, Thmuis (which means 'goat')[4].

Fragm. 24D: Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* II 8

That the sweetness of perfume and several kinds of incense and *amomum* and *cyphi*[1], *oenanthe*, musk, and the skin of the exotic mouse are serviceable to dissolute persons and lovers, will only be denied by a dissolute person.

Fragm. 25D: Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica*[1]

a) I 3: They write the word 'year' by drawing a date-palm[2].

b) I 6: When they wish to symbolize a god ... they draw a falcon[3] ... because this animal produces much offspring and lives long, but also because it seems to be the symbol of the sun, being more than all other birds sharp-sighted against the rays of the sun. This is the reason why physicians * use falcon-weed to heal eyes. And because of this, too, they sometimes draw the sun, being the lord of sight, in the form of a falcon[4].

c) I 7: One also uses the falcon to represent the soul[5].

d) I 10: To signify the only-begotten, or birth, or father, or world, or man, they draw a beetle. The only-begotten, because this animal is self-begotten, not born of the female. For its birth takes place only in the following way: when the male wishes to have offspring, it takes some cow-dung and makes a round ball of it, very much in the shape of the world. Rolling it with its hind parts from east to west, it faces the east, so as to give it the position of the world (for the world is borne from east to west, and the course of the stars is from west to east). Then, burying this ball, it puts it into the ground for twenty-eight days, during which time the moon traverses the twelve signs of the zodiac. Remaining here, the offspring of the beetle is brought to birth. And on the twenty-ninth day, when it uncovers the ball, it rolls it into the water (for it considers this day to be the conjunction of the moon and the sun, as well as[6] the birth of the world). When it is opened in the water, there emerge creatures which are beetles. (The beetle symbolizes) birth for this very reason; and a father, because the beetle takes its birth from a father only; and the world, since its birth takes place in the shape of the world; and a man, since females are not born among them[7].

e) I 11: When they want to write 'mother', or 'sight', or 'boundary', or 'foreknowledge', or 'year', or 'heavens', or 'compassionate', or 'Athena', or 'Hera', or 'two drachmas', they draw a vulture. (It means) 'mother' because there is no male in this species of animal. And they are born in this way: when the vulture hungers for conception, she opens her sexual organ to the north wind and is covered by it for five days. During this period she takes neither food nor drink, yearning for child-bearing. There are also other species of birds which conceive by the wind, the eggs of

οὐκέτι δὲ πρὸς ζῳογονίαν ἐστὶ χρήσιμα, γυπῶν δὲ ὑπηνέμιον ποιουμένων τὴν ὀχείαν, ἡ τῶν ᾠῶν γένεσις ζῳογονεῖται. βλέψιν δέ, ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων ἁπάντων ὀξυωπέστερον ὁρᾷ ἡ γύψ, ἐν μὲν ἀνατολῇ τοῦ ἡλίου ὄντος, πρὸς δύσιν βλέπουσα, ἐν δύσει δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπαρχόντος, πρὸς ἀνατολήν, ἐξ ἱκανοῦ διαστήματος ποριζομένη τὰ πρὸς χρῆσιν αὐτῇ βρώσιμα· ὅριον δέ, διότι, πολέμου μέλλοντος τελειοῦσθαι, τὸν τόπον ὁρίζει ἐν ᾧ μέλλει ὁ πόλεμος γίνεσθαι, πρὸ ἡμερῶν ἑπτὰ ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν παραγινομένη· πρόγνωσιν δὲ ἢ τῆς προειρημένης αἰτίας χάριν, ἢ ὅτι ἐπὶ πυκτείου γινομένη ἢ ἐν ἄγρᾳ, πρὸς τοὺς πλείονας σφαζομένους καὶ ἡττωμένους βλέπει, ταμιευομένη τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἐκ τῶν πτωμάτων τροφήν, παρ᾽ ὃ καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι βασιλεῖς κατασκόπους ἔπεμπον σκεπτόμενοι κατὰ ποῖον τοῦ πολέμου αἱ γῦπες βλέπουσι μέρος, ἐντεῦθεν σημειούμενοι τοὺς ἡττωμένους· ἐνιαυτὸν δέ, διὰ τὸ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ζῴῳ τριακοσίας ἑξήκοντα πέντε ἡμέρας τοῦ ἔτους διαιρεῖσθαι, ἐν αἷς ὁ ἐνιαύσιος ἐκτελεῖται χρόνος. ἑκατὸν γὰρ εἴκοσιν ἡμέρας ἔγκυος μένει καὶ τὰς ἴσας τοὺς νεοσσοὺς ἐκτρέφει, ταῖς δὲ λειπούσαις ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖται, μήτε κυοφοροῦσα, μήτε τρέφουσα. παρασκευάζουσα δὲ ἑαυτὴν εἰς ἑτέραν σύλληψιν, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς πέντε τοῦ ἔτους ἡμέρας, ὡς ἤδη προεῖπον, εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἀνέμου ὀχείαν καταναλίσκει. ἐλεήμονα δέ, ὅπερ δοκεῖ παρά τισιν ἐναντιώτατον ὑπάρχειν, ἐπεὶ τοῦτο τὸ ζῷον πάντα ἀναιρεῖ· ἠναγκάσθησαν δὲ τοῦτο γράψαι, ἐπειδὴ ἐν τοῖς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν ἡμέραις, ἐν αἷς τὰ ἑαυτῆς ἐκτρέφει τέκνα, ἐπὶ πλεῖον οὐ πέτεται, περὶ δὲ τοὺς νεοσσοὺς καὶ τὴν τούτων ἐκτροφὴν ἀσχολεῖται, ἐν αἷς ἀπορήσασα τροφῆς, ἣν παράσχηται τοῖς νηπίοις, τὸν ἑαυτῆς μηρὸν ἀνατεμοῦσα, παρέχει τοῖς τέκνοις τοῦ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνειν, ὡς μὴ ἀπορήσαντα τροφῆς ἀναιρεθῆναι. Ἀθηνᾶν δὲ καὶ Ἥραν, ἐπειδὴ δοκεῖ παρ᾽ Αἰγυπτίοις Ἀθηνᾶ μὲν τὸ ἄνω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἡμισφαίριον ἀπειληφέναι, τὸ δὲ κάτω Ἥρα, ὅθεν καὶ ἄτοπον ἡγοῦνται ἀρσενικῶς δηλοῦν τὸν οὐρανόν. θηλυκῶς μέντοι τὴν οὐρανόν, διότι καὶ ἡ γένεσις ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀστέρων ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποτελεῖται, ὅπερ ἐστὶ θηλείας ἔργον. καὶ τὸ τῶν γυπῶν δέ, ὡς προεῖπον, γένος θηλειῶν ἐστι γένος μόνων, δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν καὶ παντὶ θηλυκῷ ζῳδίῳ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι γῦπα ὡς βασίλειον ἐπιτιθέασιν, ἀφ᾽ οὗ καὶ πᾶσαν θεάν, ἵνα μὴ περὶ ἑκάστης γράφων μηκύνω τὸν λόγον, [Αἰγύπτιοι] ⟨δι᾽ αὐτῆς σημαίνουσι⟩. [μητέρα οὖν θέλοντες σημῆναι, γῦπα ζωγραφοῦσι· μήτηρ γάρ ἐστι θηλυκοῦ ζῴου.] οὐρανίαν δέ, οὐ γὰρ ἀρέσκει αὐτοῖς τὸν οὐρανὸν λέγειν, καθὼς προεῖπον, ἐπεὶ τούτων ἡ γένεσις ἐκεῖθέν ἐστι· δραχμὰς δὲ δύο, διότι παρ᾽ Αἰγυπτίοις μονάς ἐστιν αἱ δύο γραμμαί, μονὰς δὲ παντὸς ἀριθμοῦ γένεσις. εὐλόγως οὖν δύο δραχμαῖς βουλόμενοι δηλῶσαι, γῦπα γράφουσιν, ἐπεὶ μήτηρ δοκεῖ καὶ γένεσις εἶναι, καθάπερ καὶ ἡ μονάς.

which serve only for food and are not fit for hatching. But when the vultures are impregnated by the wind, their eggs are fertile. (It means) 'sight', since of all animals the vulture has the keenest vision. When the sun is rising, the vulture looks to the west, and when the god is setting, to the east, furnishing itself from a considerable distance with the food it needs[8]. (It means) 'boundary' because when a war is about to break out, it determines the place in which the battle will occur, appearing there seven days before. (It means) 'foreknowledge', either because of what has been said above or because, being present at a boxing[9] or hunting party, it looks forward to the place where the majority of the slaughtered and defeated will be, to take its share of food from the corpses. For this reason the ancient kings sent out scouts to see what part of the battle-field the vultures were looking towards, whence they calculated who would be worsted. And (it means) 'year' because in this animal are subdivided the 365 days of the year during which the time of a year is fulfilled. For it gestates for 120 days, and feeds its young for the same number. And during the remaining 120, it takes care of itself, not in pregnancy nor feeding (its young), but in preparing itself for another conception. And the remaining five days of the year, as I have already said, it consumes in intercourse with the wind. * And (it means) 'compassionate', which will seem to some to be very paradoxical, since this animal destroys all things. But they were forced to write this, since in the 120 days in which it feeds its young, it does not fly any longer, but busies itself about its young and with their food. When it has no food to offer to its young, it cuts open its own thighs and allows its young to drink its blood, so that they may not die from lack of food. (It means) 'Athena' and 'Hera', since it seems to the Egyptians that Athena has received as her portion the upper hemisphere of heaven and Hera the lower. Wherefore they hold it absurd to indicate the heaven as male. The heaven is female, for the birth of the sun and the moon and the rest of the stars, which is the work of a female, is accomplished in it. And the race of vultures, as we said above, is female only. Because of this, the Egyptians place the vulture as a crown on all female figures; consequently, [the Egyptians] use this sign for all goddesses[10] — I abbreviate in order not to write about each in turn. [Wishing to symbolize a mother, they draw a vulture, for it is the mother of a female animal.] And (it means) 'heavens' (*ourania*), for they do not like to write the word 'heaven' (*ouranos*) in the masculine, as I have said above, since the origin of the things here is from there. And (it means) 'two drachmas' because, among the Egyptians, the monad is two lines, and the monad is the origin of all numbers. It is logical therefore that when they wish to symbolize two drachmas they draw a vulture, since it seems to be mother and origin, like the monad[11].

f) I 18 (p. 51 Sb.) : ἀλκὴν δὲ γράφοντες, λέοντος τὰ ἔμπροσθεν ζωγραφοῦσι, διὰ τὸ εὐσθενέστερα αὐτῷ ὑπάρχειν ταῦτα τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος.

g) I 19 (pp. 52-53 Sb.) : ἐγρηγορότα δὲ γράφοντες ἢ καὶ φύλακα, λέοντος γράφουσι κεφαλήν, ἐπειδὴ ὁ λέων ἐν τῷ ἐγρηγορέναι μέμυκε τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, κοιμώμενος δὲ ἀνεῳγότας τούτους ἔχει, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ φυλάσσειν σημεῖον. διόπερ καὶ συμβολικῶς τοῖς κλείθροις τῶν ἱερῶν λέοντας ὡς φύλακας παρειλήφασι.

h) I 25 (pp. 68-69 Sb.) : ἄπλαστον δὲ ἄνθρωπον γράφοντες, βάτραχον ζωγραφοῦσιν, ἐπειδὴ ἡ τούτου γένεσις ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἰλύος ἀποτελεῖται· ὅθεν καὶ ἔσθ' ὅτε ὁρᾶται τῷ μὲν ἑτέρῳ μέρει αὐτοῦ βατράχῳ, τῷ δὲ λοιπῷ γεώδει τινὶ ἐμφερής, ὡς καὶ ἐκλιπόντι τῷ ποταμῷ συνεκλείπειν.

i) I 36 (pp. 81-82 Sb.) : καρδίαν βουλόμενοι γράφειν, ἶβιν ζωγραφοῦσιν· τὸ γὰρ ζῷον Ἑρμῇ ᾠκείωται, πάσης καρδίας καὶ λογισμοῦ δεσπότῃ, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ ἶβις αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτὸ τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐστὶν ἐμφερής, περὶ οὗ λόγος ἐστὶ πλεῖστος παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις γερόμενος.

j) I 44 (pp. 95-96 Sb.) : ἀθέμιτον δὲ δηλοῦντες ἢ καὶ μύσος, ἰχθὺν ζωγραφοῦσι διὰ τὸ τὴν τούτου βρῶσιν μισεῖσθαι καὶ μεμιάνθαι ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς. κενοποιὸν γὰρ ἰχθὺς πᾶς καὶ ἀλληλοφάγον.

k) I 62 (pp. 125-126 Sb.) : λαὸν πρὸς βασιλέα πειθήνιον δηλοῦντες, μέλισσαν ζωγραφοῦσι. καὶ γὰρ μόνον τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων βασιλέα ἔχει, ᾧ τὸ λοιπὸν τῶν μελισσῶν ἕπεται πλῆθος, καθὸ καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι πείθονται βασιλεῖ.

l) II 21 (p. 148 Sb.) : ἔλαφος κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν βλαστάνει τὰ κέρατα, ζωγραφουμένη δὲ πολυχρόνια σημαίνει.

Fragm. 26D : Tzetzes, *Chiliades* XII 723-736 (ed. P.A.M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, Naples 1968, pp. 499-500)

γῦπας τινὲς δὲ ἄσκεπτοι λέγουσι ζῷα τίκτειν,
ἔχειν καὶ γάλα καὶ μαστοὺς καὶ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα.
ἐγὼ δ' ὡς εὗρον ἄρρενας ἅπαντας εἶναι τίγρεις,
οὕτω καὶ θῆλυ τὸ γυπῶν ἐφεῦρον σύμπαν γένος.
πέντε δ' ἡμέραις πρὸς πυγὴν πετόμενοι ἀνέμοις,
κυρίως συλλαμβάνουσι γονὴν ὑπηνεμίαν.
ἐν ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσιν ἡμέραις δὲ γεννῶσι
τὰ ὑπηνέμια ᾠά. ἐν δὲ τοσαύταις ἄλλαις
ἐκ τῶν ᾠῶν ἐκλέπουσι καὶ νεοσσοὺς ποιοῦσιν.
ἐν ἑκατὸν ἡμέραις δὲ καὶ εἴκοσιν ἑτέραις
μέχρι καὶ πτήσεως αὐτῶν ἐκτρέφουσιν ἐκείνους.
γονὴν γυπῶν ὑπήνεμον ἔχεις, τὴν θηλυγόνον.
φανεὶς ὀνείροις δὲ ὁ γὺψ ἐνιαυτὸν σημαίνει,
οἷά σοι προκατέλεξα σαφῶς ἐξ Αἰγυπτίων.

f) I 18: When they want to write the word 'strength', they draw the front part of a lion, because this part of his body is the strongest[12].

g) I 19: When they want to write 'one who is awake and on guard', they draw the head of a lion. For the lion while awake closes his eyes, but when sleeping keeps them open. This is the symbol of being on guard. Wherefore they symbolically place lions as guard at the entrances of the temples[13].

h) I 25: When they want to write 'unformed man', they draw a frog. For frogs are born from the mud of the river. Whence sometimes it seems in parts (already) like a frog, in others (still) like something earthy. And so, when the river dries up, it vanishes with it (?)[14].

i) I 36: When they want to write 'heart', they draw an ibis because this animal is familiar with Hermes, lord of every heart and reasoning, and also because the ibis is itself like the heart. Concerning this there are many stories among the Egyptians[15].

j) I 44: When they want to represent the unlawful and defilement[16], they draw a fish, because this food is hated and they incur defilement by it in the temples. For every fish is a purgative and they eat each other[17].

k) I 62: When they want to represent a people obedient to the king, they draw a bee; for alone of the animals, the bees have a king whom the rest of the bees follow in a body, just as men obey a king[18].

l) II 21: A deer's horns grow out each year; when it is drawn, it means a long time[19].

Fragm. 26D: Tzetzes, *Chiliades* XII 723-736[1]

Some uncritical persons say that vultures bring forth living beings, and that they produce milk and have breasts and other such things. But I have found out that, just as all tigers are males, so also the whole species of vultures is female. During five days flying with the rump against the winds, they surely conceive offspring begotten by the wind. In a hundred and twenty days they produce the eggs fertilized by the wind. In again a hundred and twenty days they hatch them and make them their young. In another hundred and twenty days they nourish them untill they can fly. This is the race of vultures, begotten by the wind, generating females. When a vulture appears in your dreams, it means a year, as[2] I have exactly described it to you before, basing myself on the Egyptians.

Fragm. 27D : Tzetzes, *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem* (ed. J.A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis* III, Oxford, OUP 1841, p. 108, 8-11)

τὸ δὲ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ κρατῆσαι τὴν Θέτιν, τὸ πρακτικῶς αὐτὴν ἰδεῖν καὶ χαρῆναι. ἡ γὰρ χεὶρ κατὰ τὰ ἱερὰ συμβόλαια τῶν Αἰγυπτίων γραμμάτων τὴν πρακτικὴν ἐνέργειαν δηλοῖ.

Fragm. 28D: Ammianus Marcellinus XVII 4, 11 and XXII 15, 30 (ed. J.C. Rolfe, Loeb Classical Library, 3 vols., London (Heinemann)-Cambridge, Mass. (Harvard Univ. Press) 1935-1940)

XVII 4, 11 per vulturem naturae vocabulum pandunt, quia mares nullos posse inter has alites inveniri rationes memorant physicae, perque speciem apis mella conficientis indicant regem, moderatori cum iucunditate aculeos quoque innasci debere his signis ostendentes. et similia plurima.

XXII 15, 30 sunt et syringes, subterranei quidam et flexuosi secessus, quos (ut fertur) periti rituum vetustorum adventare diluvium praescii, metuentesque ne cerimoniarum oblitteraretur memoria, penitus operosis digestos fodinis per loca diversa struxerunt, et excisis parietibus volucrum ferarumque genera multa sculpserunt, et animalium species innumeras, quas hierographicas litteras appellarunt.

Fragm. 27D : Tzetzes, *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*, p. 108[1]

That Thetis held fast his (*sc.* Achilles') hand (*Iliad* A 316) means that he practically saw her and rejoiced. For the hand, according to the sacred symbols of the Egyptian characters, means 'practical activity'[2].

Fragm. 28D : Ammianus Marcellinus XVII 4, 11 and XXII 15, 30[1]

XVII 4, 11 : By a vulture they represent the word for the female sexual organ[2], because natural history records that no males can be found among these birds. And by the figure of a bee that makes honey-balls they designate a king, showing by these signs that in a ruler sweetness should be combined with a sting[3]. And there are many similar instances.

XXII 15, 30 : There are also syringes[4], subterranean and winding passages, which, it is said, those acquainted with the most ancient rites dug in the earth in many places with great labour, since they had fore-knowledge that a deluge was coming and feared that the memory of the ceremonies might be destroyed. And on the walls of these caverns they carved many kinds of birds and beasts and countless[5] forms of animals which they called hierographic writing[6].

NOTES TO THE TESTIMONIA

Test. 4

1 The Greek of this phrase is somewhat odd but the sense is clear. Schwyzer 24 adopts two conjectures and reads ὅστις ἀπὸ Νέρωνος ⟨ἦν καὶ⟩ συνῆν [καὶ] τοῖς μέχρι Τραιανοῦ (who lived from Nero onwards and was the contemporary of those up to Trajan). *

2 I.e., he was head of the bureau for imperial correspondence; see M. Bang in L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms* IV, Leipzig (Hirzel) 1920[10], 26ff. and H.I. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*, Toronto (Hakkert) 1974, 45, 47, 78, 141. On the kind of men appointed to the office of *ab epistulis*, see E.L. Bowie, The Importance of Sophists, in J.J. Winkler-G. Williams (edd.), *Later Greek Literature* (Yale Classical Studies 27), Cambridge (CUP) 1982, 39ff.; *ibid.* 57-59 a list of 16 Greeks with the title *ab epistulis*.

3 W. Otto, in his *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten* I, Leipzig (Teubner) 1905 (repr. Rome (Bardi) 1971), 199, argues against E. Schwartz (*RE* III (1899) 2025f.) that this passage does not imply that Chaeremon has been an ἐπιστάτης τοῦ μουσείου (director of the Museum), since the διαδοχή does not refer to this function, but to the function of head of the school of literature in Alexandria; but see Schwyzer, *Chairemon* 11. *

Test. 5

1 This letter dates from November 41 C.E. Abundant literature is mentioned by Tcherikover-Fuks, *CPJ* II 36f. H. Stuart Jones, Claudius and the Jewish Question at Alexandria, *Journal of Roman Studies* 16 (1926), 18, assumes that the Chaeremon mentioned in this letter is identical with our philosopher-priest. The other names are hardly identifiable. * See also Tcherikover-Fuks *ad loc.*, p. 44, and Schwyzer 12. The translation is of the editors of *CPJ*.

Test. 6

1 Diodorus Siculus III 3-4. On the designation 'Ethiopic' see fr. 12 n. 3.

2 Following Jacoby, I omit a sentence which is hopelessly corrupt.

3 See fr. 12.

Test. 7

1 See *C. Ap.* I 288-292 which is our fragm. 1.

Test. 8

1 This account is based upon Josephus' *Contra Apionem* I 288-292 (our fragm. 1).

Test. 9

1 That Origen knew writings of Chaeremon is apparent from *Contra Celsum* I 59 (our fragm. 3).

Test. 10

1 My translation is a thorough revision of Ker's. These sarcastic remarks, aimed at a philosopher preaching self-restraint but living at the court of Nero, are not included in Schwyzer's *testimonia*. There are more such invectives against would-be Stoics, e.g. Juvenal, *Sat.* II 1-65. *

Test. 11

1 I add this text to Schwyzer's collection of *testimonia*. Although we cannot be sure that the Chaeremon mentioned here is identical with our author, it is quite possible that Chaeremon wrote about the art of the augurs.

2 Shortly before this (p. 128,20) Galenus defined an οἰωνιστής as someone διὰ τῆς τῶν ὀρνίθων πτήσεως μαντευόμενος (who divines by means of the flight of birds).

3 *Sc.*, that it makes difference for the interpretation whether a bird flies high and far from the earth or low and at a short distance from the ground.

Test. 12

1 Cf. fragm. 12.

NOTES TO THE FRAGMENTS

Fragm. 1

1 Anti-Semitic versions of the Exodus-story were current in the Hellenistic-Roman period. We have fragments of some ten authors who wrote on this subject between the fourth century B.C.E. and the fourth century C.E. See J.G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, Nashville-New York (Abingdon Press) 1972, 113-133, and N.R.M. de Lange-C. Thoma, Antisemitismus I, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* III (1978), 116-117. Gager rightly remarks (on Manetho, but it applies as well to Chaeremon, Lysimachus, Apion, etc.): "there is general agreement that the underlying stories themselves, of which there were many versions (the invasion of Egypt by outsiders, variously called Hyksos and Syrians; the reign of terror under these outsiders who devastated the holy places of the indigenous Egyptian religion; the expulsion of the outsiders by a hero-king), reach far back into Egyptian history and that their application to the Jews is only a secondary phenomenon" (116). Traditions about the Hyksos and the Sethians have especially played a part in this development. See on these and related matters J. Marquart, Chronologische Untersuchungen 3: Die Exodusberichte des Manetho und Chairemon und die Josephsgeschichte der Genesis, *Philologus* Supplementband VII (1899), 667-693; R. Weill, *La fin du moyen empire égyptien* I, Paris (Picard) 1918, 104-111; P. Montet, *Le drame d'Avaris. Essai sur la pénétration des Sémites en Égypte*, Paris (Geuther), 1941, 173-186; J. Schwartz, Le 'cycle de Pétoubastis' et les commentaires égyptiens de l'Exode, *BIFAO* 49 (1950), 67-83, esp. 75-78; W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Wiesbaden (Harassowitz) 1962; J.G. Griffiths, *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride*, (henceforth *Plut. DIO*), Cardiff (University of Wales Press) 1970, 418-419; J. Hani, *La religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque*, (henceforth *La relig. égypt.*) Paris (Les Belles Lettres) 1976, 107-108. For commentary on our passage see J.G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion*, Basel (Bahnmeier) 1877, repr. Hildesheim (Olms) 1969, 203-205, but especially M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* I, Jerusalem (Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities) 1974, 420-421. On the relations between Jews and Egyptians in antiquity in general see S. Davis, *Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt: Greek, Egyptian, Hebrew, Roman*, London (Methuen) 1951.

2 Manetho's account has been quoted by Josephus in preceding sections, I 73-91, 93-105, 228-252. On this Egyptian priest from the first half of the third century B.C.E. see Stern, *op. cit.* I 62-86 (literature on p. 65), and H.J. Thissen, Manetho, *LdÄ* III (1980), 1180-1181. He was the first to write a history of Egypt in Greek with a strongly anti-Jewish account of the Exodus. A discussion of his name can be found in Griffiths, *Plut. DIO* 78-81.

3 Cf. *C. Ap.* I 230 and 245. Amenophis is the name of four kings in the XVIIIth Dynasty (see W. Helck-E. Otto, *Kleines Wörterbuch der Ägyptologie*, Wiesbaden (Harassowitz) 1970², 36-38). The Ramesside kings of the XIXth Dynasty follow the kings called Amenophis in the XVIIIth (Helck-Otto, *ibid.* 296-298). Since Ramesses II is probably the Pharaoh of the oppression, Chaeremon is at least right in naming him; see S. Herrmann, *Israel in Ägypten*, Stuttgart (Kath. Bibelwerk) 1970, 18.

4 M. Stern, An Egyptian-Greek Prophecy and the Tradition about the Expulsion of the Jews from Egypt in the History of Chaeremon, *Zion* 28 (1963), 223-228 (in Hebrew), and the same, *Greek and Latin Authors* I 420, has pointed out that the element of the wrath of Isis has a striking parallel in a papyrus dating from the third century C.E., in which the wrath of Isis is in some way related to the expulsion of the Jews from Egypt (according to the generally accepted restoration of the papyrus). The text may be found in *CPJ* III pp. 119-121 (no. 520). This "fragment of Graeco-Egyptian prophecy

bearing on Jews" (so the editors of *CPJ*) is related to the so-called *Oracle of the Potter*, but that work does not show anti-Semitic traits; see now the latest critical edition by L. Koenen, Die Prophezeiungen des "Töpfers", *ZPE* 2 (1968), 178-209. There is no allusion to the wrath of Isis in Manetho or other anti-Semitic authors, but it seems likely that both Chaeremon and *CPJ* 520 derive from a common Graeco-Egyptian tradition. The 'wrath of Isis' could be explained in theological terms. In the Eastern Delta the Semitic Asiatics were worshippers of Seth (= Baal), and the Osirian religion, which included Isis and Horus, was in constant confrontation with them; see e.g. J.G. Griffiths, Horusmythe, *LdÄ* III (1980), 54-59. For the importance of dream-epiphanies of Isis see J.G. Griffiths, *Apuleius of Madauros. The Isis-Book* (EPRO 39), Leiden (Brill) 1975, 139. Manetho, too, places the expulsion in the reign of Amenophis (*C. Ap.* I 230). The identification of this king remains a problem; see Stern on Manetho, *op. cit.* I 84.

5 In Manetho (*C. Ap.* I 232) this part is played by Amenophis, son of Paapis (*i.e.* Amenhotep son of Hapu), a very important and famous personage in the reign of Amenophis III. See D. Wildung, *Imhotep und Amenhotep*, München (Deutscher Kunstverlag) 1977, 201ff. The meaning of the name Phritibautes is uncertain. Probably the first element, Phri-, means "he who is in charge of"; see J. Quaegebeur, *Le dieu égyptien Shaï*, Leuven (Leuven University Press) 1975, 227; cf. A. Erman-H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache* III (repr. Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1971) 141. For the second element (-Tibautes) no satisfactory solution has been found; but cf. *p'-ḥrj-ḏb'.wt*, "he who is in charge of the seals" (*Wörterbuch* V 566).

6 Chaeremon's account must have been abridged here by Josephus. For parallels see Stern, *op. cit.* 84f. The μολυσμοὺς ἔχοντες ἄνδρες are Manetho's λεπροὶ καὶ ἄλλοι μιαροὶ ἄνθρωποι (I 233).

7 Joseph's rule over Egypt (Genesis 41) is conflated with Moses' leadership during the Exodus, and so they are made contemporaries. This anachronism occurs in some other authors as well; see the references in Stern, *op. cit.* I 420. Both Phritibautes and Joseph are depicted here as Egyptian *hierogrammateis*, a category to which Chaeremon himself belonged as well; see the Introduction and K.Th. Zauzich, Hierogrammat, *LdÄ* II (1977), 1199ff.

8 Schwyzer 57f. surmises that in the original story § 290b ran: ἡγεῖσθαι δ' αὐτῶν Τισιθέν τε καὶ Πετεσήφ, and that only at a later, anti-Jewish stage were the names of Moses and Joseph interpolated. This is probably right; see also Stern, *op. cit.* I 421. In Manetho's account the Egyptian name of Moses is Osarseph (Stern, *ibid.* 85). The name Tisithen in its present form is feminine. Perhaps it should be amended to Petisithen, "he whom Isis gives", cf. Πετήσις. Peteseph could be a corruption of Peteseth, "he whom Seth gives". It could also be a blend of Petephrê, the name of Joseph's father-in-law (Genesis 41:45, LXX), and Joseph's own name. But more probably it is a compound of Pete-, "the one given by", and of Sepa, a chthonian deity worshipped in the shape of a centipede in the neighbourhood of Heliopolis (see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 698f.). Manetho's Osarseph might be a combination of the names of Osiris and Sepa. See on these matters G. Mussies, 'The interpretatio judaica of Sarapis', in M.J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (EPRO 78), Leiden (Brill) 1979, 209-212, and also his article 'Some Notes on the Name of Sarapis', in *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren* (EPRO 68), Leiden (Brill) 1978, 821-832.

9 On the problems of localization of these events in the different versions see J. Schwartz, *BIFAO* 49 (1950), 75ff. and also J.G. Müller *ad loc.* (see n. 1).

10 The identity of this group on the border is rather unclear. Manetho introduces the Hyksos here (I 237ff.).

11 Cf. Manetho in *C. Ap.* I 246-7. Manetho's version looks much more elaborate since Josephus quotes it literally, whereas Chaeremon's account has been abridged. But in the main lines they are consonant.

12 Stern, *op. cit.* I 421: "The story ... is typical of the myth of the saviour-child and its persecution".

13 Quite unexpectedly the people expelled by Ramesses are called Jews here, and it is

not clear whether Chaeremon identifies the Jews with the diseased persons or with the people from the border or with both groups.

14 This number is enigmatic. The 250.000 defiled persons + 380.000 people from Pelusium makes 630.000. Even if Chaeremon identified the Jews only with the defiled, we still miss 50.000. "We get the impression that Josephus only used fragments from Chaeremon" (Stern I 421).

15 It is interesting and useful to see how Josephus continues in §§ 293-303 (in Thackeray's translation):

[293] "From these statements the mendacity of both writers (*sc.* Manetho and Chaeremon) is, I think, self-evident. Had they any foundation in fact, such wide discrepancy would be impossible. But consistency with others is not the concern of authors of fiction; they invent according to their fancy. [294] Thus, according to Manetho, the expulsion of the contaminated people originated in the king's desire to see the gods; Chaeremon invents his own story of the appearance of Isis in a dream. [295] Manetho says that this mode of purification was suggested to the king by Amenophis; Chaeremon mentions Phritibautes. Observe too how nearly their figures coincide in their estimate of the crowd; one speaks of 80.000, the other of 250.000! [296] Again, Manetho begins by throwing the polluted wretches into the quarries then makes them a present of Avaris for their abode and incites them to war against the rest of the Egyptians, and not until then does he represent them as appealing for aid to Jerusalem. [297] According to Chaeremon's account, they found, on their departure from Egypt, in the neighbourhood of Pelusium, 380.000 persons left there by Amenophis, with whom they retraced their steps and made a raid upon Egypt, resulting in the flight of Amenophis to Ethiopia. [298] But the gem of his narrative is his omission to state who these myriads of soldiers were or whence they came, whether they were native Egyptians or foreign immigrants. He does not even explain why the king would not admit them into Egypt, though his Isis dream about the lepers showed no lack of imagination. [299] With Moses, Chaeremon has associated as a contemporary and companion in exile, Joseph, who died four generations, that is to say about 170 years, before Moses. [300] Again, according to Manetho, Ramesses, son of Amenophis, fought as a young man in his father's army and shared his flight and banishment to Ethiopia; according to Chaeremon's version, he was born in a cave after his father's death [sic!], and subsequently defeated the Jews and drove them out, to the number of about 200.000, into Syria. [301] What reckless levity! First he omitted to state who the 380.000 were; then he tells us nothing of the fate of the 430.000, whether they fell in battle or went over to Ramesses. [302] But — most astounding fact of all — it is impossible to discover from him whom he means by the Jews or to which of the two groups he applies this designation, the 250.000 lepers or the 380.000 at Pelusium. [303] However, it would, I think, be foolish to spend more time in refuting authors who refute each other. To have left refutation to others would have shown more decency".

Fragm. 2

1 This fragment discusses the old problem, debated since the beginning of the Hellenistic era, of whether astrology was an invention of the Babylonians or of the Egyptians. Historically it is almost certain that the Egyptians took over this "science" from the Babylonians; see F. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans*, New York (Dover) 1912, 1ff.; O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, Princeton (Princeton Univ. Press) 1952, 80ff., 92ff. This is conceded, albeit indirectly, in this fragment by Chaeremon, who was an Egyptian priest himself. For other texts on this problem see e.g. Diodorus Siculus I 9; 16; 69; 81; II 31; Cicero, *De Divinatione* I 19, 36; II 46, 97; Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* VII 56; Josephus, *Antiquitates* I 168. See further W.J.W. Koster, Chaldäer, *RAC* II (1954), 1007-1021; M. Küchler, *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen*, Freiburg-Göttingen (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht) 1979, 119-121; and in general on the theme of the "first inventor" K. Thraede, Erfinder II (geistesgeschichtlich), *RAC* V (1962), 1191-1278, especially 1204ff.

2 Compare the 432.000 years in the *Babyloniaca* of the Babylonian priest Berossus (first half

of the third century B.C.E.); see S.M. Burstein, *The* Babyloniaca *of Berossus*, Malibu (Undena Publications) 1978, 13 n. 3.

3 For the curious Greek of this expression (ἑλλόγιμος ἱστορίαν συναγαγεῖν) see E. Renauld, *Étude de la langue et du style de Michel Psellos*, Paris (Picard) 1920, 195.

4 Here begins Psellus' excerpt from Chaeremon. Where it ends is a matter of great uncertainty; see below n. 5.

5 It is clear that the whole story of the flood of the Nile is an apologetic device on the part of the Egyptians in order to be able to continue their claim of the greater antiquity of their astrology against historical probability. According to Schwartz (*RE* III 2026) and Schwyzer 59-60, the excerpt from Chaeremon ends here. Sathas (*BCH* 1877, 129f.), however, claims that the whole following passage printed here still derives from Chaeremon. Schwyzer 60 argues that this is very improbable for the next paragraph because the data about Proteus and Rhapsinitus have been taken over from Herodotus (II 112 and 121), whom Chaeremon never uses as a source elsewhere. The paragraph then following (σοφία δὲ Αἰγυπτίων κτλ.) has a better chance to derive from Chaeremon, but it must remain highly uncertain. For further discussion see Schwyzer 59f.

6 There is a strong suspicion that Psellus here confuses Babylonian and Egyptian data. According to ancient chronography Ninos was the first Assyrian king (see D.O. Edzard in *Der Kleine Pauly* IV (1972), 133f.) and Joannes is probably to be identified with Oannes, the famous Babylonian sea-monster and founder of culture. See Berossus, *Babyloniaca* fragm. 1, in F. Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* III C 1, Leiden (Brill) 1958, 369f.; in Burstein's translation (*The* Babyloniaca *of Berossus* 13f.): "... a beast named Oannes appeared from the Erythraean Sea in a place adjacent to Babylonia. Its entire body was that of a fish, but a human head had grown beneath the head of a fish and human feet likewise had grown from the fish's tail. It also had a human voice. ... It gave to men the knowledge of letters and sciences and crafts of all types. It also taught them how to found cities, establish temples, introduce laws and measure land. It also revealed to them seeds and the gathering of fruits, and in general it gave men everything which is connected with the civilized life. From the time of that beast nothing further has been discovered". Burstein (10) notes that whereas for Berossus Oannes is a real messenger of the gods, in our text Ioannes has become a clever man who uses all sorts of tricks in order to realize his ambition of becoming a king. See also our fragm. 16D below. For further discussion see F.J. Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ *II*: *Der heilige Fisch in den antiken Religionen und im Christentum*, Münster (Aschaffendorf) 1922, 230ff., and especially J. Sturm, Oannes, *RE* XVII (1936), 1677-1679.

7 Th. Hopfner, *Fontes historiae religionis Aegyptiacae*, Bonn (Marcus und Weber) 1923, 183f. prints only the following passage as deriving from Chaeremon. But see n. 5 above.

8 This theme recurs in other fragments; see e.g. fr. 12; 15D; 17D. The sense of the following remarks is not completely clear. The expression ἐν κιβωτίοις probably refers to rites in the mysteries. In that context Plutarch uses the words κίστη and κίβωτιον (see Griffiths, *Plut. DIO* 451f. and especially his *Apuleius* 222ff.). This box was sometimes said to contain the head (or phallus) of Osiris; see M.S.H.G. Heerma van Voss, The Cista Mystica in the Cult and Mysteries of Isis, in M.J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Hellenistic Religions*, Leiden (Brill) 1979, 23-26. The Sphinx hanging from walls could refer only to small amuletic sphinxes.

9 Here wisdom appears to be identical with magic. The details are not clear; ἕλξις, πλάνη and ζώνη seem to be magical technical terms. At the background is perhaps the Egyptian concept of the *ba* as a bird with human head descending to the grave after wandering away from it; see S. Morenz, *Ägyptische Religion*, Stuttgart (Kohlhammer) 1960, 215f. and L.V. Žabkar, Ba, *LdÄ* I (1975), 588-590.

10 The sense of παίζουσιν ἐν τοῖς μετ' ἐκείνην θεοῖς is obscure.

11 Prof. Gwyn Griffiths suggested to me the following equations: Iacchus (Dionysus) = Osiris; Priapus = the ithyphallic Min; Sarapis = Osiris; Silenus = Anubis (?); strange-shaped Satyr = Bes. On the bull-god Apis see below fr. 17D, n. 25.

12 B.A. van Groningen, in his review of Schwyzer's edition in *Museum* 40 (1933) 230,

plausibly proposes to read here εἰς ἁγνείαν ⟨συμβάλλεσθαι⟩ πιστεύεται. That the leaves of the *vitex agnus castus* were believed to induce a state of chastity is also stated by Dioscurides, *De materia medica* I 103 and some other authors; see B.H. Stricker, De praehelleense ascese, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 19.

13 The Greek is not very clear here, but the basic idea is probably that these plants and animals procreate without female aid. The best known example is the κάνθαρος, the scarab dung-beetle; see below fr. 21D and Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 74, 381A.

14 For this word (κηροδύτης), which is not found in any of the dictionaries, see E. Renauld, *Lexique choisi de Psellos*, Paris (Picard) 1920, 63.

15 This theme of a magical cosmic *sympatheia* is also found, among other places, in Jewish mystical literature from the Talmudic period; see G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, New York (Schocken) 1961[3], 56.

16 Much in this fragment remains obscure because of the vagueness of the allusions. Hopfner, *Fontes* (see n. 7) 781f., prints as a fragment of Chaeremon a passage from Psellus published by Sathas, *BCH* 1 (1877), 204-206, but Sathas does not adduce the slightest evidence to prove that the passage really goes back to Chaeremon. Schwyzer has rightly not adopted it.

Fragm. 3

1 The translation is a revision of H. Chadwick's in: *Origen Contra Celsum*, Cambridge (Cambridge Univ. Press)1965[2], 54.

2 See for an extensive discussion of all problems connected with comets in antiquity H. Gundel, Kometen, *RE* XI (1922), 1143-1193. Generally comets were regarded as bringers of bad tidings (heralds of wars, famines, epidemics, etc.; see Gundel 1149f.). Only occasionally were they considered as good omens, as Chaeremon does here (some parallels are quoted by Schwyzer 62 and Gundel, *ibid*). In the period under consideration there appeared comets in 54 and 60 C.E. (Gundel 1188). In 54 Nero became emperor, and in 60 the comet aroused expectations of Nero's death (Seneca, *Natur. Quaest.* VII 17,2 and 21,3). Gundel 1150 and Schwyzer 62f. argue that, in view of the fact that Tacitus (*Annales* XIV 22) and Suetonius (*Vita Neronis* 36) regarded this comet as an evil omen, Chaeremon is deliberately flattering Nero; but this is only a guess, as Schwyzer himself points out. Schwyzer 63 rightly rejects the identification of Chaeremon with the Charmander mentioned in Seneca, *Natur. Quaest.* VII 5,3 (*Charmander quoque in eo libro quem de cometis composuit...*), by O. Gruppe, *Die griechischen Culte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den orientalischen Religionen*, Leipzig (Teubner) 1887, I 433 n. 2.

Fragm. 4

1 This passage presents difficulties as to the delimitation of Chaeremon's fragment. That Porphyry used Chaeremon's work here is proved by the mentioning of his name, but it is hardly credible that Chaeremon has spoken in such a critical way of Egyptian religious practices as the beginning and end of this passage do. Therefore, according to Schwyzer 63, only the factual information contained in the sentences τὸ γὰρ λέγειν ὅτι κτλ. through τῷ Τυφῶνι (8) and αὗται δὲ αἱ εὐχαί through μετασχηματιζόμενον (9) derives from Chaeremon. The fragment is quoted by Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* V 10,1-2.

2 To threaten the gods was a common practice in Egyptian magic; see S. Sauneron, Aspects et sort d'un thème magique égyptien; les ménaces incluant les dieux, *Bulletin de la société française d'égyptologie* 8 (1951), 11-21; H. Altenmüller, Götterbedrohung, *LdÄ* II (1977), 664-669. See B. Olsson, Drohungen an die Götter, in ΔΡΑΓΜΑ *M.P. Nilsson dedicatum*, Lund (H. Ohlsson) 1939, 374-378 for parallels. Helios in our text corresponds to Re or Re-Atum in the religion of Egypt, but the moon-deities in Egypt are masculine, so that a counterpart to Selene would be Thoth or Khons.

3 According to Schwyzer, it is here that the first quotation from Chaeremon begins. It appears that Chaeremon was a champion of magical practices, which were from of old part and parcel of Egyptian religion. See H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*, Berlin (De Gruyter) 1952, 435-439, and J.F. Borghouts, Magie, *LdÄ* III (1980), 1137-1151 (there further references).

4 In Abydos there allegedly was the tomb of Osiris with his head in it. In Hellenistic-Roman times it still was a place of pilgrimage (see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 2-4), although Strabo XVII 42 says that in his time it is only a small settlement.

5 The *baris* is the ship of the sun-god, the solar bark. For pictures see e.g. Bonnet in H. Haas (ed.), *Bilderatlas zur Religionsgeschichte* 2-4, Leipzig (Deichert) 1924, no. 9, and especially Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 738-740. For Egyptian instances of the threat to stop the solar bark in its course, see Altenmüller, *art. cit.* 668 n. 42. There are also several examples in Greek and Coptic magical papyri; see Schwyzer 64 with n. 1 and Griffiths, *Plut. DIO* 426f.

6 Cf. Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 18, 357F-358A: "Typhon recognized the body, and having cut it into fourteen parts, he scattered them". See the discussion by Griffiths, *Plut. DIO* 338f. and by Hani, *La religion égyptienne* 89-93.

7 The young sun-god is often represented as sitting upon a lotus-flower which emerges out of the water. For pictures see A. Erman, *Die Religion der Ägypter*, Berlin (De Gruyter) 1934, 62; Bonnet in Haas' *Bilderatlas* No. 8; literature in Hani, *La religion égyptienne* 206 n. 1. H. Schlögl's monograph *Der Sonnengott auf der Blüte* (1977) was not accessible to me. The child on the lotus, according to the Egyptian myth, is Nefertem, who is also identified with the lotus-flower held by the sun-god Re to his nose. Later the child is also called Horus or Re himself; see Griffiths, *Plut. DIO* 290; more elaborate discussion and also pictures in C. Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*, Ann Arbor (University of Michigan Press) 1950, 140-147 with Plate X nos. 203-210, and in A. Delatte-Ph. Derchain, *Les intailles magiques gréco-égyptiennes*, Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale) 1964, 106-125. The magical amulets often show the naked child seated on a lotus-flower springing from the middle of a boat. This explains the reference to a boat (in the next line), which is of course the solar bark (see n. 5).

8 On this changing aspect of the sun see R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres. Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur*, Leipzig (Teubner) 1904, 256f.

9 Augustine renders this passage from Porphyry as follows in *De civitate dei* X 11 (edd. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, Corpus Christianorum, Ser. Lat. 47, Turnhout (Brepols) 1955, 285): Dicit etiam scripsisse Chaeremonem quendam, talium sacrorum vel potius sacrilegiorum peritum, ea quae apud Aegyptios sunt celebrata rumoribus vel de Iside et Osiride marito eius, maximam vim habere cogendi deos, ut faciant imperata, quando ille qui carminibus cogit ea se prodere vel evertere comminatur, ubi se etiam Osiridis membra dissipaturum terribiliter dicit, si facere iussa neglexerint. ("Porphyry also says that a certain Chaeremon, who was an expert in such sacred things — or rather sacrileges — has written that the mysteries of Isis or her husband Osiris, which are in such repute in Egypt, have the greatest power to force the gods to do what they are bidden, when the man who tries to force the gods with spells threatens to reveal or to abolish (those mysteries), when he says in a terrible voice that he will even scatter the limbs of Osiris, if they neglect to carry out his orders.")

Fragm. 5

1 This fragment has been handed down by Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* III 4, 1-2. Schwyzer 64-68 has excellent notes and Sodano several parallels. See also the discussion by J. Pépin, Utilisations philosophiques du mythe d'Isis et Osiris dans la tradition platonicienne, in: *Sagesse et religion* (Colloque de Strasbourg, octobre 1976), Paris (PUF) 1979, 53-56.

2 The Stoic "physical explanation" of the gods and the universe by Chaeremon is unacceptable to the Platonist Porphyry. See W. von Christ-W. Schmid-O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* II 2, München (Beck) 1924[6], 858 and Pépin, *art. cit.* 59, about the probable change in Porphyry's opinion about Chaeremon; also Schwyzer 15.

3 The phrase ἐν ἀρχῆς λόγῳ τιθέμενοι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίων κτλ. is difficult. First, an important textual witness reads ἐν ἀρχῇ λόγων ('in the beginning of their expositions'). Second, the parallel passage in Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* III 13, 8 (our fr. 8) reads ἐν ἀρχῆς λόγῳ τίθεσθαι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ('giving the Egyptians pride of place'). But here the text as printed by Mras and Sodano is preferable. It might also be translated: 'stating, in their treatment of the first principle, that the gods of the Egyptians are no others than the

so-called planets'; but here that is less probable since the sun-god had primacy in Egypt. For the astrological terminology in the following passage see in general F. Boll-C. Bezold-W. Gundel, *Sternglaube und Sterndeutung*, Leipzig-Berlin (Teubner) 1931[4] (= 1966[5]).

4 The παρανατέλλοντες are the fixed stars that lie to the north or the south of the zodiac in fields that are divided up according to the sections of the zodiac. See E. Boer, Paranatellonta, *Der Kleine Pauly* 4 (1972), 504f.

5 The term *decanus*, mostly signifying an official, appears here for the first time in its astrological meaning of "a section of 10 degrees in the zodiac" (so there are 36 decans). The decans are of ancient Egyptian origin (already attested from the third millennium B.C.E.). For extensive discussions see S. Schott in: W. Gundel, *Dekane und Dekansternbilder*, Darmstadt (WBG) 1969[2], 1-21; H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 153-155; H.U. Instinsky, Decanus, *RAC* III (1957), 607f. (603-611); O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, Princeton (Princeton University Press) 1952, 81ff.

6 The horoscopes here probably mean the rising signs of the zodiac (or the rising *decanus*), here considered as personal beings. For other meanings of the word see Schwyzer 66.

7 The parallel passage in Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis* VIII 4 (our fr. 9) has κραταιοὺς καὶ ἡγεμόνας, a reading adopted by Schwyzer here, but we follow Mras and Sodano. What exactly is meant here is obscure. Schwyzer 67 points out that in some magical papyri the adjective κραταιός is attached to astral deities (see the references there).

8 Both the spelling (ἀλμενιχιακά, σαλαμινιακά, σαλμενιχιακά, σαλμεσχοινιακά) and the meaning of the word are uncertain; see W. Kroll, Salmeschiniaka, *RE Suppl.* V (1931), 843-6. Most probably it is a kind of Egyptian astrological calendar, possibly of Babylonian origin (the word may be connected with the Babylonian word *ṣalmi*, 'image', and may mean "book of the images of the astral deities"; see Kroll 844 and Schwyzer 67). Iamblichus, *De myst.* VIII 4, says the *Salmeschiniaca* are part of the Hermetic writings. J. Bidez, Les noms et les origines de nos almanachs, *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 5 (1937), 77ff., refutes the thesis that our word 'almanac' derives from it.

9 The word ἑώρα shows that the quotation has ended. The rest is a summary statement of Porphyry.

10 The use of ὁ ποταμός, 'the river', for the Nile is paralleled by the use of the Aramaic *nahara*, 'the river', for the Nile, e.g. Genesis Apocryphon XIX 12 (see J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I. A Commentary*, Rome (Pontifical Biblical Institute) 1971[2], *ad loc.*).

11 This is the kind of Stoic interpretation of Egyptian myths that Plutarch sometimes criticizes in his *De Is. et Os.*, e.g. 45, 369A; see J. Hani, *La religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque* 142-165. Several times, however, Plutarch adduces Stoic physical interpretations favourably, e.g. 40, 367C and 41, 367E; see Griffiths, *Plut. DIO* 85.

12 Schwyzer remarks (68) that this passage proves that Chaeremon advocated astrology, and that it is curious, therefore, that Iamblichus (*Myst.* IX 4) calls Chaeremon an opponent of astrology (see our fr. 8). Perhaps Porphyry's statement no longer is about Chaeremon (note the plurals).

Fragm. 6

1 This and the following fragment add no new information to fr. 5. Eusebius draws upon Porphyry.

Fragm. 7

1 Mras *ad loc.* rejects Schwyzer's emendation τοὺς Αἰγυπτίων, considering that it may be inexact quotation which gives a good sense. See above, fr. 5 n. 3. The following τούτους can only refer to the Egyptians, not to their gods.

Fragm. 8

1 Schwyzer 32 does not accord this passage the status of a fragment of Chaeremon and only quotes it in the apparatus to fr. 5. It is identical to Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis* IX 4, who quotes Porphyry here.

2 This seems to contradict what Porphyry tells in fr. 5 (see there note 12). Μαθηματικὴ ἐπιστήμη refers to astronomy and astrology. See Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus mathematicos* V 1-2. Cf. Aulus Gellius I 9, 6 vulgus autem quos gentilicio vocabulo 'Chaldaeos' dicere oportet 'mathematicos' dicit (the common people apply the term 'mathematici' to those who ought to be called by their ethnic name 'Chaldaeans'). Claudius Ptolemaeus' astronomical handbook is called μαθηματικὴ σύνταξις in the best mss.

Fragm. 9

1 Though based upon Porphyry's *Ep. ad Aneb.* II 12-13 (our fr. 5) and by and large identical with it, it nevertheless deserves to be quoted. Schwyzer quotes it in the apparatus to fr. 5. For notes see *ad* fr. 5.

2 The sense of this last sentence is not clear.

Fragm. 10

1 This is the longest and most interesting fragment that has been preserved. It presents a rather romantic and idealized picture of the daily life of the Egyptian priests. They are depicted as a group of meditating men, living a very ascetic life (strongly reminiscent of the early Christian monks), always occupied with the study of all kinds of learning. Some attempts have been made to defend the historical reliability of Chaeremons's account. But in spite of the fact that several concrete data are affirmed by other writers (see e.g. H. Strathmann, *Geschichte der frühchristlichen Askese I: Die Askese in der Umgebung des werdenden Christentums*, Leipzig (Scholl) 1914, 241) and by Egyptian sources, there has been a growing *communis opinio* that it is one more example of what Festugière has called "a literary genre well-known in the Hellenistic period: the idealized description of priestly castes or religious fraternities of barbarian peoples" (Sur une nouvelle édition du "De Vita Pythagorica" de Jamblique, *REG* 50 (1937), 470-494, quotation on p. 476). Other examples of this genre are Iamblichus' account of the Pythagorean order, Philostratus' description of the brahmans and gymnosophists, the accounts of the Essenes by Pliny and Josephus, and Philo's depiction of the Jewish community of the Therapeutae in his *De vita contemplativa*. In particular, the last-mentioned treatise of Philo shows a great number of (sometimes verbatim) parallels to Chaeremon's account, as was already noted by P. Wendland (Die Therapeuten und die philonische Schrift vom beschaulichen Leben, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, Supplement* 22 (1896), 693-772, esp. 753-756). On the basis of these close parallels, Wendland assumed that Philo knew Chaeremon's writings and reacted to it in his *De vit. cont.*, a Jewish counterpart intended to outdo Chaeremon. This thesis was refuted by R. Reitzenstein (*Des Athanasius Werk über das Leben des Antonius. Ein philologischer Beitrag zur Geschichte des Mönchtums*, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophish-historische Klasse 8, Heidelberg 1914, 43) and especially by I. Heinemann (Therapeutai, *RE* V A (1934), 2337-38). The materials collected by A.J. Festugière (*art. cit.* and also *La révélation d'Hermes Trismégiste I: L'astrologie et les sciences occultes*, Paris (Lecoffre) 1944 (1950²), 19-44) have shown that it is much more probable that both authors largely draw on a traditional vocabulary designed to describe the ideal way of life of a community of philosophizing saints. Cf. also Otto, *Priester und Tempel* II 167f., 209ff. The parallels between Philo and Chaeremon will be cited in the following notes (Schwyzer 79-80 gives a convenient synopsis). On the Therapeutae see further F. Daumas, La 'solitude' des Thérapeutes et les antecédents du monachisme chrétien, in: *Philon d'Alexandrie* (Colloque de Lyon 11-15 Septembre 1966), Paris (Editions du centre national de la recherche scientifique) 1967, 347-358; and for more recent literature E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesu Christ* II, rev. ed. by G. Vermes-F. Millar-M. Black, Edinburgh (Clark) 1979, 591-597.

The text of the fragment is not that of A. Nauck's edition (Leipzig, Teubner, 1886), but that of the newest critical edition of Porphyry's *De Abstinentia* by J. Bouffartigue and M. Patillon (in the Collection Budé). The volume containing Book IV is still in preparation, but both editors have kindly put their text at my disposal, for which I am very grateful.

* The few places where I differ from them have been indicated.

2 In Hellenistic times, a shift towards a more ethical and religious sense of the words φιλοσοφία, φιλοσοφεῖν is clearly visible, as it is here; see A.M. Malingrey, *Philosophia: Étude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque des Présocratiques au IV^e siècle après J.C.*, Paris (Klincksieck) 1961. Cf. Philo on the Therapeutae, *Vit. cont.* 28 φιλοσοφοῦσι τὴν πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν. For the monastic function of Egyptian temples in the Hellenistic-Roman period see J. Hani, *La religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque*, Paris (Les Belles Lettres) 1976, 268.

3 Cf. Iamblichus, *De vita Pythagorica* 96 πάντες οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι τοὺς ἱεροπρεπεστάτους τόπους ἀεὶ ἐξελέγοντο, μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἑωθινὸν περίπατον τότε πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐνετύγχανον, μάλιστα μὲν ἐν ἱεροῖς, εἰ δὲ μή γε, ἐν ὁμοίοις τόποις (all Pythagoreans always chose the most holy places, and after their morning-walk they met one another, mostly in temples, but if not, in similar places). Porphyry, *De Abst.* I 36 the Pythagoreans κατῴκουν ... τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ τὰ ἄλση ἐξ ὧν πᾶσα ἀπελήλαται τύρβη (they lived in the temples and the sacred groves, from which all tumult had been expelled). Cf. Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* I 4 and 8.

4 On which see C.J. Bleeker, *Egyptian Festivals*, Leiden (Brill) 1967.

5 Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V 4, 19, 3 διὰ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς (*sc.* the Egyptians) ἀδύτων καλουμένων ... μόνοις ἐξῆν ἐπιβαίνειν αὐτῶν τοῖς ἱερωμένοις (Only their consecrated members were allowed to set foot within what they called their sanctuaries).

6 On the requirement of purity when entering a temple see the texts quoted in my *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, Leiden (Brill) 1978, 258f. Cf. Eusebius-Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.* XI 23 on Sarapis' temple in Alexandria, *in quibus ... hi quos appellabant* ἁγνεύοντας, *id est qui se castificant, commanere soliti erant* (in which those whom they called *hagneuontes*, i.e. those who purify themselves, used to stay).

7 B.A. van Groningen, in his review of Schwyzer in *Museum* 40 (1933), 230, rightly defends the mss.' *lectio* πόρους, 'resources, revenue', which makes very good sense, against the often adopted conjecture πόνους.

8 Schwyzer 81 refers to the Egyptian *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* 71 ἱερεῦσιν οὐκ ἐξὸν πρὸς ἄλλῃ χρείᾳ εἶναι ἢ τῇ τῶν θεῶν θρησκείᾳ (the priests are not allowed to occupy themselves with any other activity than the service of the gods). Nauck's conjecture θεραπείᾳ (worship) for θεάσει (a rare word but in all mss.) is generally accepted since in the following sentence it is said to produce, *inter alia*, τὸ εὐσεβές, and in other authors (see Schwyzer 42 in *app. crit.*) there is a connection between θεραπεία θεῶν and τὸ εὐσεβές. But θεάσει gives an excellent sense and is rightly defended by I. Heinemann, *RE* V A 2337. On the etymological wordplay implied here (θεός- θεᾶσθαι-θεωρεῖσθαι) see my article 'A Word-play in I John 4:12?', *Zeitschrift f. neutest. Wiss.* 63 (1972), 280ff.

9 Compare with this whole passage Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 2, 351F-352A, and the notes of Grifiths *ad loc.*, 260-262. On ἐγκράτεια, which is a recurrent theme not only in this fragment but also in other idealized descriptions of communities of sages (Festugière, *RÉG* 50 (1937), 476f.), see H. Chadwick, Enkrateia, *RAC* 5 (1962), 343ff.

10 This double translation of ἁγνεία (purification and fasting) and ἁγνεύειν (to purify oneself and fast) is based upon the fact that both semantic aspects are present in this context. From the beginning fasting has always been a cathartic ritual (see P. Gerlitz, Fasten als Reinigungsritus, *ZRGG* 20 (1968), 212-222). Hence a word meaning 'purity' or 'purification' could develop the sense of 'fasting' as is the case with ἁγνεία in many later Greek texts, e.g. Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 6, 353B. This meaning is not registered in LSJ. See on this terminology R. Arbesmann, *Das Fasten bei den Griechen und Römern* (RGVV 21), Giessen (Töpelmann) 1929, 7ff.; *idem*, Fasten, *RAC* 7 (1969), 450f.; B.H. Stricker, De praehelleense ascese, *OMRO* 50 (1969), 8ff. (the third in a long series of articles since 1967, all bearing the same title).

11 Cf. Philo, *Vit. cont.* 30 ... ἕκαστοι μονούμενοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς λεχθεῖσι μοναστηρίοις φιλοσοφοῦσιν (they philosophize by themselves each in solitude in the cells mentioned above).

12 I do not adopt ἅτε, Nauck's conjecture for ἢ. Although ἅτε gives better sense when one reads κατανεμόμενοι with the mss., I agree with Schwyzer who now proposes (letter

of Aug. 13, 1980) to read ἢ ... κατανεμομένοις, 'or with those who divided...', which is a more attractive emendation.

13 On ἁγνευτήρια see J. Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, London (SPCK) 1964², 48 n. 2, who discusses another occurrence of this rare word, in Pap. Oxyr. 840,8, where, too, it is a part of a temple.

14 On this motif of withdrawal from the world (ἀναχώρησις) see Festugière, *REG* 50 (1937), 476f.; cf. Philo, *Vit. cont.* 24 ὀχληρὸν γὰρ καὶ δυσάρεστον τοῖς ἐρημίαν ἐζηλωκόσι καὶ μεταδιώκουσιν αἱ γειτνιάσεις (living in proximity is troublesome and unpleasant to people who strive after solitude). Here, however, the withdrawal is only partial.

15 Comparable thoughts are found in Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 77, 382C-D. On τῦφος, Philo, *Vit. cont.* 39 ἀσκοῦσιν ἀτυφίαν κτλ. As to φυσικὸς λόγος, it is a Greek philosophical term for the allegorical, 'physical' interpretation of the gods. One should realize that in Stoicism theology was the most important part of 'physics'. See H. Leisegang, Griechische Philosophie als Mysterion, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 35-38 (1932), 245-252; P.W. van der Horst in *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 35 (1981), 268.

16 This combination of σεμνός and εὔτακτος in relation to behavior is also found in Ps-Hippocrates, *De medico* 1 (p. 20, 11-12 Heiberg; also from the beginning of the C.E.). See the notes by A.H.M. Kessels, Notes on Ps-Hippocrates' De medico, *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 31 (1978), 117-118.

17 Philo, *Vit. cont.* 31 καθεστῶτι τῷ βλέμματι! On this strikingly literal parallel see Festugière, *REG* 50 (1937), 484.

18 See Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 29 for parallels, and esp. J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek* * *Concept of the Soul*, Princeton (Princeton Univ. Press) 1983, 85-87.

19 Philo, *Vit. cont.* 30 εἴσω τὰς χεῖρας ἔχοντες (having their hands inside the robe). A special application of this custom was to cover the hands when carrying particularly sacred objects as the *cista mystica* and the vase with Osirian Nile water; see the pictures in J. Leipoldt-W. Grundmann, *Umwelt des Christentums* III, Berlin (Evangelische Verlagsanstalt) 1967, nos. 292, 294, and 297; no. 299 gives an example of a similar usage in the * Early Church; also Cumont, *Religions orientales*⁴, Pl. V 3, VII 2, VIII 1.

20 See W. Otto, *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten* I, Leipzig (Teubner) 1905, * repr. Rome (Bardi) 1971, 23ff.

21 On the theme of the frugality and abstinence of the Egyptian priests see Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 301-305, and Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 23ff.; and 50 (1969), 12ff. Philo, *Vit. cont.* 37 σιτοῦνται δὲ πολυτελὲς οὐδέν, ..., ἀλλ'αὐτὰ τὰ χρήσιμα ὧν ἄνευ ζῆν οὐκ ἔστι. διὰ τοῦτο ἐσθίουσι μὲν ὥστε μὴ πεινῆν, πίνουσι δὲ ὥστε μὴ διψῆν (they eat nothing expensive, ... but only such things as are needed and without which one cannot live. Therefore they eat enough to keep from hunger and drink enough to keep from thirst). Cf. *ibid.* 73 and Porphyry, *De Abst.* IV 12f. on the Essenes. The combined abstinence from wine and meat is often mentioned in descriptions of diverse marginal groups (Pythagoreans, Orphics, Therapeutae, Christian hermits, Manichaeans, etc.); see the passages mentioned * by J. Bremmer, Marginalia Manichaica, *ZPE* 39 (1980), 32-33. Over against this and other Greek accounts of the ascetic way of life of the Egyptian priests stand data from later Egyptian sources which suggest the contrary; see H. Brunner, Enthaltsamkeit, *LdÄ* I (1975), 1229-1231, esp. 1231 n. 19.

22 According to Herodotus II 37 the priests did drink wine; according to Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 6, 353A-B, sometimes they did, sometimes not, depending upon time and circumstances. See Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 314ff. and the survey by Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 21. Philo, *Vit. cont.* 37 ποτὸν δὲ ὕδωρ ναματιαῖον αὐτοῖς ἐστιν (their drink is spring-water); cf. 74. Further Jewish parallels are noted by Stricker, *ibid.*

23 That alcoholic drinks induce sexual desires is a well-known theme in ancient wisdom literature; see M. Küchler, *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen*, Göttingen (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht) 1979, 454ff.; my dissertation *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, Leiden (Brill) 1978, 154; Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 20f. The theme is elaborated in *Test. Judae* 14-16.

24 According to Otto, *Priester und Tempel* II 167, this simply is not true.

25 Philo, *Vit. cont.* 37 σιτοῦνται ... ἄρτον εὐτελῆ καὶ ὄψον ἅλες οὓς οἱ ἁβροδίαιτοι

παραρτύουσιν ὑσσώπῳ (they eat simple bread and salt for a relish, which the fastidious flavour with hyssop). See further Schwyzer 82 and Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 23.

26 Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 37 notes parallels.

27 Cf. Herodotus II 37 (with A.B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II*, Leiden (Brill) 1976, 169); Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 7, 353C-D οἱ δ' ἱερεῖς ἀπέχονται πάντων, sc. ἰχθύων (the priests abstain from all kinds of fish), with Griffiths, *Plut. DIO* 277f.; Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica* I 44. See further F.J. Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ II 55ff.; I. Gamer-Wallert, Fische, *LdÄ* II (1977), 228-234. Cf. Iamblichus, *Vita Pyth.* 98.

28 Schwyzer 44 *ad loc.* notes some parallels.

29 Philo, *Vit. cont.* 73 τράπεζα καθαρὰ τῶν ἐναίμων (the table is kept pure from the flesh of animals). Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 261f., notes that Egyptian sources do not support this statement. Cf. J. Haussleiter, *Der Vegetarismus in der Antike*, Berlin (Töpelmann) 1935, 33ff.

30 Cf. Daniel 10:3.

31 Jerome's excerpt of this same passage (*Adv. Jovinianum* II 13; see below fr. 11) adds that they regarded eggs as liquid meat. See Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 23.

32 Cf. Herodotus II 41 τὰς δὲ θηλέας οὔ σφι ἔξεστι θύειν ... τὰς βοὺς τὰς θηλέας Αἰγύπτιοι πάντες ὁμοίως σέβονται προβάτων πάντων μάλιστα μακρῷ (they are not allowed to sacrifice female cows... all Egyptians worship them much more than all other cattle). Bonnet, Kuh, *Realllexikon* 402-405 eso. 405 on the degree of reliability in Greek accounts of Egyptian cow worship).

33 *Sc.* as divine beings.

34 For this translation of the obscure Greek see Festugière, *Révélation* I 29.

35 Schwyzer 45 rightly remarks on the expression πρὸς ἀνθρωπείαν ἐμφέρειαν νεύοντα: adhuc explicatione caret. Festugière, *ibid.*, translates: "ceux qui inclinent la tête à la manière de l'homme", which is possible as well, but the whole remains somewhat obscure. If my translation is correct, it may refer to the fact that the Egyptians would be repelled by the idea of eating animals which recalled the human form, such as apes (just as they opposed to human sacrifice; see J.G. Griffiths, Menschenopfer, *LdÄ* IV 64f.)

36 Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 31, 363B also uses the term παρατήρησις in connection with the work of the *moschosphragistai* (on which see the next note).

37 *Moschosphragistai* are the priests who inspected the animals for sacrifice. Herodotus II 38 and Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 31, 363A-B, describe how the priest marked the approved animal with a seal. For details see Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I 84f.; Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II* 172f.; Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 415f.; Stricker, *OMRO* 55 (1974), 190f.

38 Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* VI 4, 36, 2 mentions μοσχοσφραγιστικά, which consisted of 10 books. Some fragments of such ritual books have been discovered in Oxyrhynchus and published by V.B. Schumann, A Second-Century Treatise on Egyptian Priests and Temples, *HTR* 53 (1960), 159-170, and by R. Merkelbach, Ein ägyptischer Priestereid, *ZPE* 2 (1968), 7-30.

39 See the remarks by Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ II 81f.

40 The text is in disorder here. The mss. have προλαμβάνων, which is hard to translate. Nauck, for obvious reasons, conjectured τρόπος for χρόνος, and προλαμβάνοντες for προλαμβάνων. Schwyzer adopted προλαμβάνοντες, while Bouffartigue and Patillon adopt neither conjecture. All these solutions are unsatisfactory. I adopt προὐλάμβανον, a conjecture of Prof. Griffiths (letter of 23-11-'82).

41 On these varying terms see Stricker, *OMRO* 50 (1969), 11. For parallels in Jewish mystical literature see I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, Leiden (Brill) 1980, 99-100.

42 Philo, *Vit. cont.* 73 (quoted above, n. 25).

43 Herodotus II 37 and Lloyd *ad loc.* (168). Diodorus Siculus I 89, 4 and A. Burton, *Diodorus Siculus Book I. A Commentary*, Leiden (Brill) 1972, 260. Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 5, 352F and Griffiths *ad loc.* (272).

44 Herodotus II 64 and Lloyd *ad loc.* (287f.); E. Fehrle, *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum*, Giessen (Töpelmann) 1910, 155ff. Bouffartigue and Patillon, following Hercher, unnecessarily

athetize ἀφροδισίων. As to Chaeremon's remark about their rejection of male homosexuality, it can be said that for the most part it was not favoured by the Egyptians. In the protestations of innocence in the *Book of the Dead* 125 (b12) it is said, "I have not practised homosexuality" (T.G. Allen, *The Egyptian Book of the Dead*, Chicago (Univ. of Chicago Press) 1960, 197). Yet it is occasionally ascribed to the gods; see J.G. Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*, Liverpool (Liverpool Univ. Press) 1960, 41-46.

45 On these regular ablutions with cold water see J. Gwyn Griffiths, *Apuleius of Madauros: The Isis-Book (Metamorphoses Book XI)*, Leiden (Brill) 1975, 286f. (*ad* XI 23). Herodotus II 37 λούονται δὲ δὶς τῆς ἡμέρας ἑκάστης ψυχρῷ καὶ δὶς ἑκάστης νυκτός (they bathe in cold water twice every day and twice every night); discussion and literature in Lloyd *ad loc.* (166f.), and R.A. Wild, *Water in the Cultic Worship of Isis and Sarapis*, Leiden (Brill) 1981, 143-148. Cf. Porphyry, *De Abst.* IV 12 on the Essenes. See also R. Ginouvès, ΒΑΛΑΝΕΥΤΙΚΗ. *Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque*, Paris (Boccard) 1962, esp. 317 and 402f. Cf. I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* 101f.

46 Jerome calls it *baiae* in his excerpt (*Adv. Iovinianum* II 13). On the many different forms of this word see D. Sperber, Greek and Latin Words in Rabbinic Literature, *Bar Ilan* 14/15 (1977), 30f. See further Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica* I 3; LSJ 303 for instances from the papyri; esp. W.E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford (Clarendon Press) 1939, 27. For the motif cf. Philo, *Vit. cont.* 69.

47 Cf. B.H. Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 26.

48 A similar motif in Philo, *Vit. cont.* 37.

49 Mss. ἑώραις, but see Schwyzer 46 in *app. crit.* and cf. Plutarch, *An seni respublica gerenda sit* 18, 793B αἰώραις καὶ περιπάτοις.

50 Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 20 for parallels.

51 Nauck omits ἢ τρὶς ἢ because in the immediately following words not three but four times of hymn-singing are mentioned. Schwyzer 47 prefers to read only τρὶς since the following καὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν stands in an inept position and has the same meaning as πρὸς δύσιν καταφερόμενον, *sc.* ἥλιον. From a historical point of view τρὶς would be preferable (see Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 26 n. 318), but the mss.' reading could be retained here except for καὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν, which looks like a later gloss. For the motif cf. Philo, *Vit. cont.* 26 and 29.

52 Cf. Isocrates, *Busiris* 23 τοὺς δὲ νεωτέρους ἀμελήσαντας τῶν ἡδονῶν ἐπ' ἀστρολογίᾳ καὶ λογισμοῖς καὶ γεωμετρίᾳ διατρίβειν ἔπεισεν (He [*sc.* the mythical Egyptian king Busiris] persuaded the younger priests to neglect pleasure and to devote themselves to astrology, to arithmetic, and to geometry). *Busiris* 21-23 is a praise of the way of life of the Egyptian priests which shows several similarities to Chaeremon's account (see also next note).

53 Cf. Isocrates, *Busiris* 21 τοῖς ... ἱερεῦσι παρεσκεύασεν εὐπορίαν μὲν ταῖς ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν προσόδοις, σωφροσύνην δὲ ταῖς ἁγνείαις ταῖς ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων προστεταγμέναις, σχολὴν δὲ ταῖς τῶν κινδύνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἔργων ἀτελείαις (he [Busiris] saw to it that from the revenues of the sacrifices the priests should acquire affluence, but self-control through the purifications and fasts prescribed by the (religious) laws, and leisure by exemption from risks and, in general, from other activities).

54 Compare the strict community rules in Qumran (1QS, CD); discussion in G. Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community* (Coniectanea Biblica, N.T. Series 5), Lund (Gleerup) 1972, 39-86.

55 For the list of different kinds and ranks of priests see W. Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I 84ff.; F. Zimmermann, *Die ägyptische Religion nach der Darstellung der Kirchenschriftsteller und die ägyptischen Denkmäler*, Paderborn (Schöningh) 1912, 135-153; F. Cumont, *L'Égypte des astrologues*, Brussel (Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth) 1937, 121ff.; S. Sauneron, *Les prêtres de l'ancienne Égypte*, Paris (Du Seuil) 1957 (E.T. *The Priests of Ancient Egypt*, London (Chapman) 1960); L. Vidman, *Isis und Sarapis bei den Griechen und Römern. Epigraphische Studien zur Verbreitung und zu den Trägern des ägyptischen Kultes* (RGVV 29), Berlin (W. de Gruyter) 1970, 57-65. Chaeremon's list by and large agrees with the lists in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* VI 4, 35, 3f. and in the decrees of Canopus and

Rosetta; see W. Dittenberger, *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae* I, Hildesheim (Olms) 1960 (repr. of the ed. of 1905), no. 56, 3-5, and no. 90, 6-7. These texts are discussed in R. Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. *Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Giesen (Töpelmann) 1927, 78ff., 90f. An English translation of the Rosetta decree can be found in E. Bevan, *The House of Ptolemy*, Chicago (Argonaut) 1968, (repr. of the London 1927 ed.), 263ff. Schwyzer 84 presents a convenient synopsis of the lists in Chaeremon, Clement, and Canopus/Rosetta (these two are partly identical; for differences in the rendering see F. Daumas, *Les moyens d'expression du grec et de l'égyptien comparés dans les décrets de Canope et de Memphis*, Cairo (IFAO) 1952, 179-186).

56 It has long been unclear why one class of Egyptian priests, *ḥmw-nṯr* (litterally 'servants of god'), is always termed προφῆται by Greek authors, for they were not officials of oracles, as the Greek term suggests, but probably the highest class of priests. See the extensive discussion of this problem by Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ 76-100 ("προφήτης als Übersetzung eines ägyptischen Priestertitels"); also M.C. van der Kolf, Prophetes, *RE* XXIII 1 (1957), 801f. But in his article 'Der berichtende Gottesdiener', *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 85 (1960), 138-143, H. Kees has demonstrated that these priests certainly were sometimes cast in this role. Cf. the title *ḥm-nṯr wḥm*, 'the servant of the god who carries the message', *i.e.* of the oracle. See also S. Morenz, *Ägyptische Religion*, Stuttgart (Kohlhammer) 1960, 109.

57 *Hierostolistai* were the priests who, *inter alia*, clothed the statues of the gods; see Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I 84ff.; Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 258; Vidman, *Isis* 62f.; Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 266f.

58 *Hierogrammateis* were important priests in the second class. Among their many functions were the finding of sacred animals, the testing of candidates for priesthood, the interpretation of dreams, the foretelling of the future, and especially the cultivation of the knowledge of the ancient Egyptian scripts. They were regarded as the most important representatives of Egyptian science, scholarship, and magic. Chaeremon himself is said to have been one of them (see Introduction). See Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I 88f.; Cumont, *L'Égypte des astrologues* 121f.; Griffiths, *Apuleius* 265; G. Posener, *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*, 3ᵉ série, 25 (1951), 167f.; esp. K.Th. Zauzich, Hierogrammat, *LdÄ* II (1977), 1199-1201 (with more literature).

59 *Horologoi* were the priests whose task was the observation of all astronomical phenomena; see Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I 89f.; Zimmermann, *Die ägypt. Relig.* 150f.; Cumont, *Égypte des astrologues* 124; Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 307; Griffiths, *Apuleius* 283.

60 *Pastophoroi* were generally not regarded as priests within Egypt but were probably cult-superintendents who supervised the carrying of the sacred objects; outside Egypt they were often given higher status. The exact meaning of *pastos* in this connection remains uncertain (possibly a little shrine, cf. Herodas, *Mim.* IV 56). Discussion in Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I 94ff.; Cumont, *Égypte* 126, Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 258f.; Griffiths, *Plut. DIO* 265f.; Griffiths, *Apuleius* 265f.; Vidman, *Isis* 61f.; Spiegelberg in Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 583f.; especially H.B. Schönborn, *Die Pastophoren im Kult der ägyptischen Götter* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 80), Meisenheim am Glan (A. Hain) 1976 (and the review by J.G. Griffiths, *Classical Review* 28 (1978), 95-6); J.G. Griffiths, Pastophoren, *LdÄ* IV (1983), 914.

61 *Neokoroi* and *hypourgoi* are probably priests (?) of the lowest grade, whose functions are unclear. See the discussion in Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I 112f.; Cumont, *Égypte* 123; Vidman, *Isis* 57-60.

Fragm. 11

1 This passage is an epitome of Porphyry's *De Abstinentia* IV 6-8 (our fr. 10). Hence no comments are needed here, with one exception (see next note).

2 Here Jerome shows that he not only knew Porphyry's rendering but also read the source himself by inserting a verbatim quotation from Chaeremon. On this quotation see the discussion by J. Bernays, *Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit. Ein Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte*, Berlin (Hertz) 1866, 150f. Cf. Stricker, *OMRO* 49 (1968), 22.

3 This detail as well seems to derive directly from Chaeremon and not from Porphyry.

Fragm. 12

1 The first to draw attention to this fragment of Chaeremon was S. Birch in his article 'On the Lost Book of Chaeremon on Hieroglyphics', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, 2nd series, 3 (1850), 385ff. See also C. Wendel, Zum Hieroglyphenbuche Chaeremons, *Hermes* 75 (1940), 227-229 and H. Felber, *Quellen der Ilias-Exegesis des Joannes Tzetzes*, diss. Zürich 1925, 24-26. It is to be noted here that no Greek or Latin author of non-Egyptian origin ever took the trouble to learn Egyptian. The various reports about the hieroglyphs (which proved of much greater fascination to the ancients than the other types of Egyptian writing) are almost always erroneous. Several hieroglyphic compilations are known to have existed already in Hellenistic times, but only two have survived, the one of Chaeremon only in this small excerpt by Tzetzes (a twelfth century Byzantine scholar) and the *Hieroglyphica* of Horapollo in its entirety (probably compiled in the fourth century C.E.). In both authors an allegorical conception of the signs is found. That even their most extravagant allegorical fancies can be traced to one of the established functions of the Egyptian signs is due to the fact that they were undoubtedly based on genuine Egyptian sources. If the introductory lines of the present passage derive from Chaeremon himself (which is not wholly certain; they might be Tzetzes' own), it would appear that Chaeremon, in spite of his being an Egyptian priest, adhered to the erroneous Greek symbolic conception of the hieroglyphs which has had such a fateful influence in the West till the nineteenth century. That even Egyptian priests in the Hellenistic-Roman period often no longer knew the exact significance of many hieroglyphs is probable. See on all this the studies by E. Iversen, *The Myth of Egypt and its Hieroglyphs in European Tradition*, Copenhagen (Gad) 1961 (46-7 on Chaeremon) and his article 'The Hieroglyphic Tradition', in J.R. Harris (ed.), *The Legacy of Egypt*, Oxford (Clarendon Press) 1971^2, 170ff. Also my article 'The Secret Hieroglyphs in Classical Literature', in J. den Boeft-A.H.M. Kessels (edd.), *Actus. Studies in Honour of H.L.W. Nelson*, Utrecht (Instituut voor Klassieke Talen) 1982, 115-123. One of the difficulties of the present fragment is that some of the interpretations are based upon the Ptolemaic sign system, which was much more complex than the classical system; see E. Hornung, *Einführung in die Ägyptologie*, Darmstadt (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft) 1967, 24f., and especially H.W. Fairman, Introduction to the Study of Ptolemaic Signs and their Values, *BIFAO* 43 (1945), 51-138.

2 On Tzetzes as an exegete of Homer and other classical authors see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* II, München (Beck) 1978, 59ff.

3 Αἰθιοπικὰ γράμματα: the Ethiopian origin of Egyptian characters (and of Egyptian culture generally) was a belief occasionally held in the late Hellenistic and Roman eras; see e.g. Diodorus Siculus III 3, 4-5 and Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* IV 8, 1. Birch, On the Lost Book (see n. 1) 390ff.; Wendel, *Hermes* 1940 (see n. 1) 227f.; P. Marestaing, *Les écritures égyptiennes et l'antiquité classique*, Paris (Geuthner) 1913, 47-51. 'Ethiopia' in these contexts refers mainly to the land of Nubia, immediately to the south of Egypt, *i.e.* the Egyptian Kush. Egypt had early links with Nubia and there were cultural and religious influences in both directions, but the Egyptian scripts owed nothing to Nubia. See T. Säve-Söderbergh, *Ägypten und Nubien*, Lund (Ohlsson) 1941.

4 Diodorus Siculus III 4,1. On φυσικὸς λόγος see note 15 to Fragm. 10.

5 Instead of the mss.'s ἀλληγορικῶν καὶ συμβόλων one should read either ἀλληγοριῶν καὶ συμβ. (Schwyzer) or ἀλληγορικῶν συμβ. (Wendel).

6 Diodorus Siculus III 3, 5. That the priests deliberately cultivated and even increased the 'secret' character of the hieroglyphs in Hellenistic-Roman times in order to make themselves into an exclusive body of sacerdotal scholars is very probable; see Iversen, *The Myth of Egypt* 24f.

7 In the following notes, when Chaeremon's interpretation corresponds to an established meaning of the sign in classical Egyptian, reference will be made to A.H. Gardiner's "Sign-list" in his *Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford (Clarendon Press) 1957^3, 438-548. When it is a Ptolemaic sign, it will be indicated as well (Ptolemaic signs are not in Gardiner's list).

8 Ptolemaic sign.
9 This is perhaps a confusion of two (or three) signs : Gardiner A2, 'man with hand to mouth', is a determinative for 'eating', 'drinking', 'speaking', etc.; Gardiner A7, 'man sinking to ground from fatigue' is a determinative for illness and the like; possibly also A14, 'man with blood streaming from his head' while he is beinding down to earth, a determinative for 'dying'. It is unknown whether there was a mixed form of some of these signs in Ptolemaic times.
10 Gardiner D9.
11 Gardiner D35 (ideogram for negation).
12 New Ptolemaic ideogram for 'to go out'.
13 New Ptolemaic ideogram for 'to enter'. Both signs (nos. 5 and 6) are used in astronomical texts for the rising and setting of stars; see Iversen, *The Myth of Egypt* 47 (cf. 24).
14 Ptolemaic determinative, but also earlier for 'repeating life' (Gardiner I 7). See W. Spiegelberg-A. Jacoby, Der Frosch als Symbol der Auferstehung bei den Aegyptern, *Sphinx* 7 (1903), 215-228; M. Weber, Frosch, *RAC* 8 (1972), 524-538, esp. 526f. L. Kákosy, Frosch, *LdÄ* II (1977), 334f. Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica* I 25, has a different interpretation; see the discussion in F. Sbordone, *Hori Apollinis Hieroglyphica*, Napels (Loffredo) 1940. 69-70, and note 14 to our Fragm. 25D.
15 Gardiner G53 (not necessarily a falcon; see Schwyzer 50 *ad loc.*); cf. G29 and Horapollo I 7.
16 Gardiner G7 (cf. G5 and G9, all true falcons). Cf. Plutarch, *De Is et Os.* 32, 362 F; Horapollo I 6; Chaeremon (?), fr. 19D; fr. 21D; fr. 25D. Hani, *La religion égyptienne* 398f. With the sense of 'god' the falcon must be shown on a perch. The meaning 'sun' would attach to the falcon in a name such as Re-Harakhty, the sun-god who combines the deities Re and Horus of the Horizon; cf. Gardiner C2.
17 Of the two major mss. of Tzetzes' Iliad exegesis, one has γυναικός here (Cod. Lipsiensis gr. 32; see L. Bachmann, *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem* I, Leipzig (Kollmann) - London (Black, Young and Young) 1835, 823), the other omits it (Cod. Cantabrig. gr. R. 16.33; see Lolos' edition 12).
18 Gardiner G14 affirms only the meaning of 'mother'. As a Ptolemaic sign it can mean 'year' (cf. 'time'). The meaning of 'heaven' is not attested.
19 Gardiner L2 (king of Lower Egypt); Horapollo I 62 (see fr. 25D); Ammianus Marcellinus XVII 4,11 (see fr. 28D).
20 Gardiner L1. Cf. Horapollo I 10 (see fr. 25D below). The meaning 'male(s)' is not attested, but see note 7 to fr. 21D. Classical parallels in Schwyzer 51 *ad loc.* and Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 407 n. 4.
21 This is unattested but has parallels in Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 39, 366E; Clement Alex., *Strom.* V 7, 42, 3 (fr. 19D); Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I 19,13. Marestaing, *Ecritures égyptiennes* 130, takes βοῦς to mean 'cow' and suggests that the equations Isis = cow, and Isis = earth, have induced the further equation cow = earth.
22 Gardiner F9 (head of a leopard); F4 (forepart of a lion) does not mean 'strength'. Cf. Horapollo I 19 (below fr. 25D); some other parallels in Schwyzer 51. The manuscript reading ἀρχήν is to be corrected to ἀλκήν (cf. fragm. 19D).
23 This is nowhere attested. Gardiner F22 (hind-quarters of a lion or leopard) does not mean 'necessity'.
24 This is probably a mistake. The Ptolemaic sign of a calf can mean 'year'.
25 Gardiner M4. Cf. Horapollo I 3 (below fr. 25D).
26 Cf. Gardiner A 17; also Ptolemaic.
27 Cf. Gardiner A19; also Ptolemaic.
28 Not attested, but cf. A12 (soldier with bow) and T9 and 10 (bows) for 'army', etc.

Fragm. 13

1 The life spans assigned to this mythical bird in classical times are 1, 500, 540, 654, 1000, 1461 years, and 972 human generations (Tacitus, *Annales* VI 28, remarks: *de numero annorum varia traduntur*). The number of 7006 years occurs nowhere else. R. van den Broek, in his comprehensive study *The Myth of the Phoenix according to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (EPRO 24), Leiden (Brill) 1972, 109, suggests that possibly Tzetzes did not transmit Chaeremon's text accurately or that the figures 7006 and 7777

(which Aëtius, *Placita* II 32,5 says that some assigned to the so-called 'great year') both go back to an original 7776. Elsewhere (416) he remarks that Chaeremon's 7006 years may derive from a no longer traceable calculation of the 'great year'. But this is speculative, and the number remains unexplained. Chaeremon is one of the ten authors from the first century C.E. who are known to have mentioned the phoenix (Van den Broek, *op. cit.* 393 n. 2, mentions all of them).

Fragm. 14

1 For much in the notes on this fragment I am indebted to Dr. D. M. Schenkeveld, Professor of Greek at the Free University in Amsterdam. The fragment discusses the question of whether the σύνδεσμοι παραπληρωματικοί (expletive "conjunctions", e.g. ἄρα, γε, δή, θήν, νῦν, που, τοί; see Dionysius Thrax, *Ars Grammatica* 20,8) are rightly called conjunctions. We call them particles. For the phenomenon of a historian writing on grammatical matters see W. von Christ-W. Schmid-O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* II 1, München (Beck) 1920⁶, 383 n. 5.

2 A patronymic in meaning is e.g. Ἀγαμεμνονίδης, which means 'son of Agamemnon'; a patronymic in form but not in meaning is e.g. Εὐριπίδης. In the first case there is a congruence between form and meaning, but not in the second case. With Schwyzer I read τὸ ἐν δηλ. instead of τι ἐν δηλ.

3 These are not the possessive pronouns but possessives which, like the patronymics, are derived from names or nouns, e.g. Δήλιος, Ὁμήρειος, Λυβικός, and the like.

4 The real σύνδεσμοι (like καί, ὅτι, etc.) could, according to some ancient grammarians, sometimes be pleonastic. So the conjunctions meant here by Chaeremon are not the παραπληρωματικοί.

5 About this Philoponus nothing is known.

6 A German translation of this fragment can be found on p. 139 of R. T. Schmidt, *Die Grammatik der Stoiker* (Schriften zur Linguistik 12), Braunschweig-Wiesbaden (Vieweg) 1979; this book is K. Hülser's translation of Schmidt's *Stoicorum Grammatica* of 1839. Hülser's translation of this fragment is, however, far from being correct.

Fragm. 15D

1 Schwyzer adopted this passage from Psellus as the first *fragmentum dubium*, although he himself rightly remarks (p. 61) that the last sentence (ἐκεῖνοι δέ φασι διὰ τούτων εἰκονίζειν τὰ νοητά) decidedly tells against Chaeremon's authorship, since in fr. 5 Chaeremon explicitly denies that there is an intelligible world. Nevertheless, F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans la paganisme romain*, Paris (Geuthner) 1929⁴, 328 n. 48, considers this passage as deriving from Chaeremon without giving any reason.

Fragm. 16D

1 This fr. is the immediate continuation of fr. 15D. The first editor of this passage, Sathas (*BCH* 1, 1877, 201), suggests that it derives from Chaeremon. Bidez and Schwyzer (61) suspect that it may derive from the Babylonian-Greek author Berossos; see fr. 2 with note 6. Schwyzer does not print the passage neither does Jacoby; I print it for the sake of completeness, although I strongly doubt Sathas' ascription.

2 See fr. 2 note 6 for a translation of Berossos' account of Oa(n)nes. The Babylonian myth has been transferred to Egypt.

3 Bidez suggests to read ἀποκτενοῦντες, which is attractive.

Fragm. 17D

1 Schwyzer 14-5 adduces the following arguments for considering this passage from Porphyry as deriving from Chaeremon: 1) Fr. 5 states that Chaeremon interpreted Egyptian myths as referring to the heavenly bodies; the same thing is done in this fragment. 2) In test. 9 it is said that Origen used the same allegorical method as Chaeremon and Cornutus. Porphyry's *De cultu simulacrorum* shows close contacts with that method. 3) The passage about man-worship in Anabis recurs in 21D (his fragm. 9), which is regarded by Schwyzer on other grounds as going back to Chaeremon. 4) There are points of agreement with fr. 12 (Tzetzes), which certainly derives from Chaeremon. 5) There are agreements with

fr. 19D (his fr. 8, from Clement of Alexandria), which very probably derives from Chaeremon. All these factors do not prove that the present passage from Porphyry is indeed based upon Chaeremon, but it has a rather high degree of probability. See on this fr. also C. Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus* II, München (Beck) 1969, 854.

2 Kneph was the name of the serpent-deity of Thebes which became incorporated in the creator-god Amun. The attributes described here (human form, sceptre, *anch*-sign, royal feather) all apply to Amun (and not to Chnubis or Chnum as was formerly thought; see Schwyzer 68f.). Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 21, 359A, mentions Kneph as a Theban deity; see Griffiths' discussion *ad loc.*, p. 374, for other references and literature; also Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 378f.

3 All mss. have ζώνην, 'girdle' (see Mras *ad loc.*), but Schwyzer 33 rightly adopts the conjecture ζωήν. Amun and other gods do not have a girdle in their hand, but the *anch*-sign (*anch* is Egyptian for 'life'), see e.g. Bonnet in Haas, *Bilderatlas* nrs. 85, 86, 88, 89, 91, etc. or *Reallexikon* 32; Erman, *Religion* 37. Mras thinks the error was already made by Porphyry or Eusebius. Hence he prints ζώνην.

4 Probably λόγος refers to ἀνθρωποειδής; δυσεύρετος καὶ ἐγκεκρυμμένος καὶ οὐ φανός refers to τὴν δὲ χροιὰν ἐκ κυανοῦ μέλανος; ζῳοποιός refers to ζωήν; βασιλεύς refers to βασίλειον; νοερῶς κινεῖται refers to ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς πτερόν (so Schwyzer 33). The word ἐγκεκρυμμένος reminds one of Manetho's explanation of the name Amun as κεκρυμμένος in Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 9, 354D, which is very probably correct; see Griffiths *ad loc.*, p. 285.

5 Although not all details are clear, there is evidence that in the Theban cosmogony of the Hellenistic period Kneph produced an egg from his mouth and Ptah came forth out of the egg; see Schwyzer 69. Mostly Ptah himself is represented as forming the world-egg. (Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 162f. *s.v.* Ei, and 614-619 *s.v.* Ptah). A late Theban inscription speaks of "Ptah, who created the egg which came forth from Nun". See S. Morenz, *Ägyptische Religion*, Stuttgart (Kohlhammer) 1960, 188 and J. Bergman, *Isis-Seele und Osiris-Ei*, Uppsala (Berling) 1970, 81.

6 The ancient Egyptians had some gods who, as creators of the universe, were worshipped as cosmic gods and represented in human form. These gods (most often Amun and Ptah) were thought of as encompassing the whole of creation within their body, as being conterminous with the cosmos. This idea had great influence in later Orphism. See on this whole matter the study by R. van den Broek, The Sarapis Oracle in Macrobius' Sat. I 20, 16-17, in: *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren* I, Leiden (Brill) 1978, 123-141, esp. 135-139 (with further references and lit.).

7 The text as it stands is problematic because (a) the repetition in πλοῖον, τοῦ πλοίου is awkward, (b) one misses a ποτὲ δέ, and (c) in fr. 19D (Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* V 7,41,2) it is said: Αἰγυπτίων οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ πλοίου, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ κροκοδείλου τὸν ἥλιον δεικνύουσι. This makes the conjecture (made long ago by Potter; see Bidez *ad loc.*) ... πλοῖον, ποτὲ δὲ ἐπὶ κροκοδείλου attractive, for it solves these three problems. However, "the man put upon a crocodile" is problematic as well. One might refer to Bonnet's picture no. 154 in Haas' *Bilderatlas* where Osiris' corpse is lying upon a crocodile, or, less improbably, to no. 162 where Horus is standing upon crocodiles (see also Plate 9 in J.R. Harris (ed.), *The Legacy of Egypt*, Oxford (Clarendon Press) 1971[2]). But "a man in a boat put upon a crocodile" makes more sense. See the picture of this scene in G. Roeder, *Kulte, Orakel und Naturverehrung im alten Ägypten*, Zürich-Stuttgart (Artemis) 1960, Plate 12 (and compare the amulet in E.R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman period* III, New York (Pantheon) 1953, no. 1104, where Helios stands on a lion, the lion on a crocodile). It is the sun-god in the solar bark fighting with his enemy. The crocodile was an ambivalent animal in ancient Egypt. On the one hand it was worshipped as a god and could be identified with Osiris, on the other hand it was regarded as an enemy of the gods and could be identified with Seth; see E. Brunner-Traut, Krokodil, *LdÄ* III (1980), 791-801; L. Kákosy, Krokodilskulte, *ibid.* 801-811. For the well-known solar bark see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 738ff and the pictures in *Bilderatlas* nos. 9, 10, 15, 19, 163, etc., or in A. Erman, *Die Religion der Ägypter*, Berlin (W. de Gruyter) 1934, 18.

So I prefer to leave the text as the mss. have it, although I still suspect that something is in disorder here.

8 Again a typical *interpretatio graeca*. On the paragraphs 49-51 see the discussion by Pépin, Utilisations philosophiques 56ff. (see n. 1 to fr. 5).

9 I athetize καί with Bidez. For several of the equations in this and the following paragraphs (49-51) parallels in Plutarch can be found easily in Griffiths' *Plutarch's DIO* 575f. The equation of Isis with the earth is discussed by Hani, *Relig. égypt.* 146 (there more references) and of Isis and the moon *ibid.* 219ff. For the etymology Isis — ἰσότης and others see Griffiths on Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 2, 351E and 60, 375C (*ibid.* 257ff. and 515f.). Note the Greek etymology of the Egyptian name, as in Plutarch. For the relation Isis — δικαιοσύνη see Hani, *Relig. égypt.* 39f. The idea that ἰσότης is the source of δικαιοσύνη occurs also in Philo and elsewhere; see my *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, Leiden (Brill) 1978, 205 and Pépin, Utilisations philosophiques (see n. 1 to fr. 5) 57 for references.

10 Schwyzer 70f. suggests that his passage (from τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ δύναται through καταναλισκομένην εἰς τροφάς) is an interpolation from the hand of Porphyry, since only here are equations with Greek gods mentioned. He may be right. The equation Isis-Demeter is discussed by Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 73-77 and 168. For Isis-Kore (Persephone) cf. Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 27, 361E and Griffiths *ad. loc.* 392f. For Osiris-Dionysus cf. Plutarch, *De Is. et Os* 28, 362B; 34, 364D; 37, 365E, and Griffiths, *ibid.* 429f.; also Cumont, *Religions orientales*[4] 72f. and the extensive discussion by Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 166ff. Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 529f. gives many (classical and Egyptian) parallels to the idea that Isis and Osiris are the nourishing and fertilizing powers of the earth and of the fruits of the earth. Plutarch objects to the too narrow identification of the gods with physical products (*De Is. et Os.* 66, 377C-E).

11 If Schwyzer is right that the preceding paragraph is an interpolation by Porphyry and that here Chaeremon's account is resumed again, then the subject of λαμβάνεται may be Isis. For this idea Schwyzer 71 n. 3 refers to Lucian, *Dialogus deorum* 7 (3), which does not prove his point, and to Servius *ad Aen* VIII 696 (*Isis ... Nili accessus recessusque significat*). But on the basis of this one late parallel one cannot rule out the much more probable interpretation that Osiris is here the subject. Νεῖλον εἶναι τὸν Ὄσιριν (Plut., *De Is. et Os.* 32, 363D) was a widespread idea; see Griffiths *ad. loc.* 420f.; Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 144ff.; Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 527f.

12 Schwyzer 71 suggests: either this is a reminiscence of the relation between Nile and Nun, the primeval water which may also come down from heaven in the form of rain (see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 525f., and B. van de Walle's and J. Vergote's commentary on Horapollo I 20 in *Chronique d'Égypte* 35 (1943), 61-63; cf. the equation Hapy = Nile = rain, see D. van der Plas, *De Hymne aan de Overstroming van de Nijl*, Utrecht (Elinkwijk) 1980, 63); or Chaeremon thinks of the Homeric expression (*Odyssey* IV 477) Αἰγύπτοιο διιπετέος ποταμοῖο ὕδωρ ('the water of the Egyptian river falling down from heaven').

13 ἀνήρ refers to κύει in the preceding clause, ἀδελφός to ἰσοῦται, and υἱός to ποιεῖ τοὺς καρπούς. So Mras *ad loc.*

14 The word ἀλλὰ (thus in other editions) is difficult here. I felt inclined to delete it (cf. Mras *ad loc.*), but my colleague Dr. G. Mussies ingeniously suggested the reading πεπλασμένον μὲν ἄλλα ἀνδρείκελον ..., κεφαλὴν δὲ κριοῦ κεκτημένον = formed in all other respects like a man ... but having the head of a ram.

15 Both the description of the image and the mention of Elephantine leave no doubt that the god meant is Chnum, on which see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 135-140 (a picture on 137). On the confusion of ram and goat (κεφαλὴν κριοῦ and κέρατα τράγεια) see Erman, *Religion der Ägypter* 43f. and Schwyzer 71f. Cf. also H. Kees, *Der Götterglaube im alten Ägypten*, Leipzig (Hinrichs) 1941, 80f. The κύκλος δισκοειδής is an attribute of Chnum-Re.

16 F. Börtzler, *Porphyrius' Schrift von den Götterbildern*, diss. Erlangen 1903, 18f. n. 1 proposes the attractive emendation δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ μὲν τοῦ κριοῦ ... instead of ἀπὸ μέν.

17 There was a great sanctuary of Horus in Apollinopolis Magna (Edfu). The image described here is one of Horus (on which see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 307-314) in his fight with Typhon-

Seth. On the walls of the temple of Edfu the hippopotamus and the crocodile are depicted as Sethian enemies being hunted by Horus; see Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 490 (on *De Is. et Os.* 50, 371 C) and his article 'The Interpretation of the Horus-Myth of Edfu', *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 44 (1958), 75-85. For a picture see H.W. Fairman, *The Triumph of Horus*, London (Batsford) 1974, 109 (cf. 87, 90, 94, 98, 101, 111). Horus is usually a sun-god, but Horus of Edfu was also a moon-god (see Griffiths, *ibid.* 508 and W. Barta, Horus von Edfu, *LdÄ* III (1980), 34). The smiling of Horus' eye is explained by Plutarch as the waning of the moon, *De Is. et Os.* 55, 373E. On the falcon as hieroglyph for the sun see fr. 12. The hippopotamus as the western horizon swallowing the stars that set there is an otherwise unknown interpretation (Schwyzer 73 n. 2 remarks that according to Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica* I 69 the crocodile means the west). On the hippopotamus and its meanings see Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 434-7. *

18 In Eileithyiaspolis (El Kab) the vulture-goddess Nekhbet was worshipped; see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 507f.; and especially Ph. Derchain, *Elkab* I, Brussel (Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth) 1971, and H.J. de Meulenaere, Elkab, *LdÄ* I (1975), 1225-1227. Sometimes, already in the Pyramid-texts, she is addressed as the moon. Cf. Plutarch, *Quaestiones conviviales* III 10, 3, 659A (Eileithyia = moon). Nekhbet was also one of the two goddesses of kingship.

19 On this idea see below fr. 25D and 26D. That the moon generates the winds is an idea for which there is no Egyptian evidence. It is odd, moreover, that, whereas the moon is said to generate the winds, its symbol — the vulture — is said to conceive from the winds.

20 This short passage is rightly regarded by Schwyzer 73f. as an interpolation by Porphyry, who wanted to show his knowledge of astral symbolism in Greek religion.

21 Almost the same story is told by Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 29, but that may derive from Chaeremon or whoever was Porphyry's source. Occasionally, deification was accorded to some outstanding private individuals, most notably to Imhotep and Amenhotep son of Hapu, and it was a proces that included cults and temples. In the case of Imhotep, Saqqara was the most important cultic centre but it spread to other areas, including Athribis in the Southern Delta. (It might be that Anabis in our text is a corrupted form of Athribis). This cult was still very much alive in the Hellenistic and Roman era. See on all this D. Wildung, *Egyptian Saints. Deification in Pharaonic Egypt*, New York (N.Y. University Press) 1977, 31ff., especially 54 and 74-76, and cf. Diod. Sic. I 13,1. *

22 For this interpretation cf. the passages mentioned by F. Zimmermann, *Die ägyptische Religion nach der Darstellung der Kirchenschriftsteller und die ägyptischen Denkmäler*, Paderborn (Schöningh) 1912, 87ff., especially 89.

23 The reference is probably to the Apis bull, which is said by other classical authors as well to be dedicated to the moon; see below note 25 and Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 462.

24 On Mnevis, the bull-god of Heliopolis, see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 468-470; W. Helck, Mnevis, *Der Kleine Pauly* III 1374f.; Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 425; Hani, *Relig. égypt.* 419-421. Its blackness is also mentioned by Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 33, 364B-C. The hairy tail is mentioned by Herodotus III 28. Its big testicles can be seen on the picture in Erman, *Die Religion der Ägypter* 27. All the references to and descriptions of the Mnevis in classical literature may be found in Hopfner's *Fontes historiae religionis Aegyptiacae* 873. Patristic parallels in Zimmermann, *op. cit.* 98ff.

25 On Apis, the bull-god of Memphis, see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 46-51 (pictures on 49 and 50); J. Vercoutter, Apis, *LdÄ* I (1975) 338-350; and especially G.J.F. Kater-Sibbes and M.J. Vermaseren, *Apis* I-III, Leiden (Brill) 1975-1977; see further Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 462f.; Hani, *Relig. égypt.* 413-419. All passages in Greek and Latin literature are listed in Hopfner, *Fontes* 813-815; patristic parallels in Zimmermann, *op. cit.* 94ff. The beetle mark under its tongue is also mentioned by Herodotus III 28. The scarab-beetle (*Khepri*) as symbol of the sun-god is well-known (Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 720-722). On Apis as moon-god see above n. 23 and Schwyzer 75 for references. On both Mnevis and Apis see E. Otto, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stierkulte in Aegypten*, Hildesheim (Olms) 1964 (repr. of the ed. of 1938), 11-40.

Fragm. 18D

1 Schwyzer includes this fragment in his edition because here he sees reflected Chaeremon's tendency to identify Egyptian deities with heavenly bodies. This seems to me to be an insufficient reason for this attribution, although it cannot, of course, be entirely ruled out. The text is also found in some other tenth and eleventh century Byzantine writings (partly anonymous; see H. Herter, *De Priapo* (RGVV 23). Giessen (Töpelmann) 1932, 290) but the Suda's version is the most reliable; see Schwyzer 75. Schwyzer, *ibid.*, gives no convincing arguments for his assertion that this fragment was quoted in Lydus' *De mensibus* (R. Wünsch rightly did not include it in his 1898 edition of Lydus; see Praef. p. XIV).

2 The identification of Horus and Priapus is also found in Procopius, *De Bellis* 19, 35; see Herter, *De Priapo* 291, for the text. Actually, not Horus but Min is meant here; Min and Horus were sometimes identified or combined; see Plut., *De Is. et Os.* 56, 374B, and Griffiths, *Plut. D10* 506. Herter, *op. cit.* 290f.

3 Probably a whip; see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 461, and Herter, *op. cit.* 291f.

4 For Min as creator and ruler see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 463.

5 Min was an ithyphallic god of vegetation and reproduction; this facilitated his identification with Priapus and Pan; see Herter, *op. cit.* 292f.; and Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 462f. on Min as a vegetation god.

6 For Min's identification with the sun or the sun-god Amon-Re see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 31f., and H.W. Helck, Min, in *Der Kleine Pauly* III (1969), 1314f. On Min in general see A. Erman, *Die Religion der Ägypter*, Berlin (de Gruyter) 1934, 35ff. (a picture of a statue of Min on p. 35; Cf. Bonnet, *Reall.* 32); H. Gauthier, *Les fêtes du dieu Min*, Cairo 1931 (non vidi); J.C. Bleeker, *Die Geburt eines Gottes. Studie über den ägyptischen Gott Min und sein Fest*, Leiden (Brill) 1956; R. Gundlach, Min, *LdÄ* IV (1983) 136-140.

Fragm. 19D

1 There are several agreements between this text and our fr. 17D from Porphyry's *De cultu simulacrorum*. Schwyzer 77 says that if Chaeremon was the source there, he must be the source here. Moreover, the symbolic interpretation of animals occurring here is also found in the authentic fragm. 12. But as it remains uncertain whether fr. 17D derives from Chaeremon, so it must remain uncertain here as well. There is an excellent commentary on this passage in A. le Boulluec, *Clément d'Alexandrie, Les Stromates. Stromate V*, vol. 2 (Sources chrétiennes 279), Paris (Du Cerf) 1981, 166-171.

2 See note 7 to fragm. 17D.

3 Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 158, points to several places bearing the name Diospolis. The temples often had a pylon in front. Here, it seems, a particular pylon was called 'The Sacred'.

4 See the notes to fragm. 12, nos. 18 and 19 (nn. 24 and 25).

5 See note 15 to fragm. 12, no. 9.

6 Cf. Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica* I 44. A hieroglyph in the form of a fish was regularly used as the determinative of the word *bwt*, 'abomination'; see Griffiths, *Plutarch's D10* 422, and Le Boulluec, *op. cit.* 169.

7 In Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 32, 363F it is the hippopotamus that is a symbol of shamelessness. For commentary see Griffiths *ad loc.*, 423. The presence of the crocodile in Clement's text remains enigmatic; see Le Boulluec, *op. cit.* 169f.

8 Schwyzer does not note the striking parallel to this whole passage in Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 32, 363F: "In Saïs, on the pylon in front of Athena's temple there had been engraved a child, an old man, and after this a falcon, and then a fish, and behind them all a hippopotamus. It meant symbolically, 'O you who are being born and you who are dying, God hates shamelessness'. For the child is a symbol of birth, the old man of death; with a falcon they denote a god, with a fish hatred, as we have said, because of the sea, and with a hippopotamus shamelessness". Griffiths *ad loc.* 422 remarks: "Plutarch's 'symbolical' explanation cannot be derived from these signs in the manner denoted by him, but Ptolemaic writing in its condensed or cryptic form might indicate some of the meanings thus".

9 On this kind of votive offering see D. Wachsmuth, Weihungen, *Der Kleine Pauly* 5 (1975), 1358, and Le Boulluec, *op. cit.* 170, but especially F.T. van Straten, Votive Offerings Representing Parts of the Human Body, in: H.S. Versnel (ed.) *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, Leiden (Brill), 1981, 105-150. In Egypt eyes and ears were often shown on stelae; the ears are mostly interpreted as those of the god who listens, but the eyes are sometimes assigned in the texts to the petitioner. See M. Sandman-Holmberg, *The God Ptah*, Lund (Gleerup) 1946, 69ff.; W. Hornbostel, *Sarapis* (EPRO 32), Leiden (Brill) 1973, 193ff.; especially R. Schlichting, Ohrenstelen, *LdÄ* IV (1983), 562-566 (a picture at 565 and in Erman, *Religion* 145). The final words ('god sees and hears all things') are an echo of Homer's *Iliad* III 277.

10 Some of these interpretations are also presented in fragm. 12; see the notes there. More details can be found in Le Boulluec, *op. cit.* 170.

11 *Comasiae* are the processions of the images of the Egyptian gods (see Clement's description in *Strom.* VI 4, 35-37), discussed by H.W. Fairman, Worship and Festivals in an Egyptian Temple, *BJRL* 37 (1954/5), 165-203. The word occurs further only in papyri; see F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden ... aus Ägypten* III, Berlin (Selbstverlag) 1931, 381 and *ibid. Supplement* I (ed. E. Kiessling), Amsterdam (Hakkert) 1971, 435.

12 H. Kees, in Bonnet's *Reallexikon* 44, calls these interpretations "kosmologische Deuteleien" for which there is little or no basis in Egyptian sources, but see Le Boulluec, *op. cit.* 171. Cf. on the ibis Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 75, 381D: "the variety and combination of her black feathers with her white picture the moon in its first quarter". Parallels from Christian authors are noted by F. Zimmermann, *Die ägyptische Religion* (see n. 22 to fragm. 17D.) 116ff. The ibis stands for Thoth who is a lunar deity; see P. Boylan, *Thoth, the Hermes of Egypt*, Chicago (Ares Publishers) 1979 (= 1922), 62-75. The two dogs probably refer to the Anubis jackals, often present on funerary monuments; see K. Herbert, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Brooklyn Museum*, Brooklyn (The Brooklyn Museum) 1972, 57 with nn. 5-6 and Plate XVII, and F.A. Hooper, *Funerary Stelae from Kom Abou Billou*, Ann Arbor (Kelsey Museum of Archeology) 1961, 22f.

Fragm. 20D

1 This notoriously difficult passage from Clement of Alexandria has been included by me because in his article 'Clément d'Alexandrie et l'écriture égyptienne; essai d'interprétation de Stromates V 4, 20-21', *Le Muséon* 52 (1939), 199-221 (see esp. 219f.), the Egyptologist J. Vergote has tried to demonstrate that Clement's account of the types of Egyptian script derives from Chaeremon. Again, this cannot be proved, but in view of the fact that Chaeremon wrote a book called *Hieroglyphica*, which was still known to Tzetzes, it is highly probable. For the older literature on this passage see Vergote 199-200. Vergote's study is an extensive Egyptological commentary on this passage. Hence for details the reader is referred to that article and also to the recent commentary by A. le Boulluec (see n. 1 to fragm. 19D), 97-105.

2 Clement clearly mentions the three well-known types of Egyptian script: demotic (which he aptly calls 'epistolographic'), hieratic, and hieroglyphic. It is very remarkable that Clement is the only ancient author (with Porphyry, *Vita Pyth.* 12, though this is very uncertain) to distinguish these three types. All other classical authors distinguish only two types, hieroglyphic and demotic; see P. Marestaing, *Les écritures égyptiennes et l'antiquité classique*, Paris (Guethner) 1913. On demotic see E. Lüddeckens, Demotisch, *LdÄ* I (1975), 1052-1056; on hieratic H. Satzinger, Hieratisch, *ibid.* II (1977), 1187-1189; on hieroglyphs H.G. Fischer, Hieroglyphen, *ibid.* II (1977), 1189-1199. A less technical introduction to Egyptian scripts may be found in J. and L. Scott, *Egyptian Hieroglyphs for Everyone*, New York (Funk-Wagnalls) 1968 (74-76 on hieratic and demotic). The problems of our text start here, with the subdivision of the hieroglyphic type.

3 Here the alphabetic use of hieroglyphs is meant. τὰ πρῶτα στοιχεῖα are the alphabet; see Stählin-Früchtel 534 and Le Boulluec 99f.

4 In the following passage the pictographic or 'symbolic' use of hieroglyphs is again subdivided into three different types, of which examples are given (see next notes).

5 This is the first sub-type, the so-called ideograms or, what is possible as well, determinatives; see Vergote 209f.

6 Much remains obscure in this very difficult passage but Clement probably means what Vergote calls the 'improper' use of ideograms (212), i.e., the phonetical use of ideograms as tri- and biliteral signs. For instance, the sign of a scarab (*ḫpr*) means 'to become' (*ḫpr*) on the basis of a phonetic agreement. Clement's readers could easily verify this principle in the great temple inscriptions (bas-reliefs) to which he refers; see the detailed discussions in Vergote 211-218 and Le Boulluec 101-103.

7 The third sub-type concerns the 'allegorical' use of ideograms in which equations no longer have a phonetic basis. For instance, the sign of a scarab (*ḫpr*) is then used for 'sun' (*re*), an equation which is based upon certain ideas which often can no more be detected by us. See Le Boulluec 103f. and H. Brunner, Bildliche Ausdrücke und Übertragungen, *LdÄ* I (1975), 806.

8 For this digression on the scarab-beetle cf. fragm. 21D and the notes. Vergote's conclusion (219) is that Clement knew almost perfectly the different systems of Egyptian writing, unlike all other ancient authors, and that most probably he got his information from the *Hieroglyphica* of Chaeremon; Le Boulluec (98) shares this opinion.

Fragm. 21D

1 Schwyzer includes this passage in his edition on the following grounds (77f.): in *De Abst.* IV 6-8 Porphyry quotes Chaeremon, a quotation which is clearly concluded at the end of ch. 8 (see fr. 10). But in ch. 9 there occur some data that we know from other fragments of Chaeremon, e.g. the worship of a man in Anabis (fr. 17D), the significance of the falcon and beetle (fr. 13). The lines dealing with these things are attributed by Schwyzer to Chaeremon and others are, somewhat arbitrarily, taken to be Porphyry's additions. But it should be remarked that the authenticity of fr. 17D is very uncertain and that the observations on falcon and beetle are paralleled in other sources as well. Schwyzer does not mention the thesis of M. Wellmann, who (in his article 'Aegyptisches', *Hermes* 31 (1896), 221-253) argues on the basis of correspondences between this passage from Porphyry and passages from Plutarch, Aelian, and Macrobius that Apion is their common source. This cannot be proven either but is not less probable than Schwyzer's assumption. Again, however, it cannot be disproved that Porphyry goes back to Chaeremon here, and hence the text is included in this edition.

2 On Egyptian lion-worship see C. de Wit, *Le rôle et le sens du lion dans l'Égypte ancienne*, Leiden (Brill) 1951, and Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 427-29.

3 This whole sentence is rather unclear. Hence the translation is tentative. In the first half I adopt Heikel's conjecture θείου instead of θεοῦ. In the second half Schwyzer 40 reads ὧν ἕκαστον τῶν θεῶν ⟨τινα⟩ πάρεσχεν, and renders in *app. crit.*: 'vim enim divinam quae in omnia diffunditur, per pagorum animalia, e quibus quidque deum quendam significabat, colebant". But I prefer the text as printed by Mras and Des Places in their editions of Eusebius, and by Bouffartigue and Patillon in their (forthcoming) edition of *De Abstinentia*.

4 See fragm. 17D n. 21.

5 This passage is partly paralleled in Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 51, 317F, and Aelian, *De natura animalium* II 42; see Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 494; Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 399. The detail about "shrieking over an exposed corpse" is found only here and it recalls the funerary role of Isis and Nephthys as lamenting falcons; see J.G. Griffiths, *The Origins of Osiris and his Cult*, Leiden (Brill) 1980, 34. For the belief that the light of the sun dwells in the eyes of men see Th. Hopfner, *Plutarch: Über Isis und Osiris* II, repr. Darmstadt (Wissensch. Buchgesellschaft) 1967, 223, who refers to a papyrus where it is said that sun and moon are indefatigably radiating from the eyes of men. Eusebius' quotation from Porphyry abruptly ends in the middle of this sentence (after ἐπαμώμενον) and is resumed again some lines further with κάνθαρον δὲ κτλ.

6 The sense of these last few words is uncertain. If one adopts the old conjecture οἰκεῖν for κινεῖν, cited by Nauck, it might refer to the indwelling of statues and temples often ascribed to the gods. On falcon-worship in Egypt in general see H. Altenmüller, Falke,

LdÄ II (1977), 94-7. On its role in beliefs concerning life after death see also Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 179. On its mantic powers after death Aelian, *De natura animalium* XI 39.

7 On the connection of the scarab-beetle with the sun see Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 74, 381A with Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 555f. and Hani, *La religion égypt.* 407-9; also Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 720-2. The sun-god in Egypt was often considered to be a big scarab-beetle: Khepri. Griffiths 556 remarks: "One wonders whether the meaning of the Egyptian name ('He who comes into being (of himself)') may not have originated the common belief that all scarab-beetles were male; at least it denotes the same idea of self-generation". For parallels in other classical authors see Schwyzer 51 and Griffith and Hani, *loc. cit.* See also the note on fr. 12 nr. 12, and fr. 25D n. 7.

Fragm. 22D

1 Schwyzer includes this passage in his edition, although he admits that the attribution to Chaeremon (proposed by Reitzenstein) is uncertain. It is, however, almost certain that this passage does not derive from Chaeremon. The problem is the identification of "the Egyptian" mentioned in the first sentence. Festugière has made a very strong case for assuming that here the author of one of the many Hermetic writings is meant (Une source hermétique de Porphyre: l'"Egyptien" du *De Abst.* II 47, *RÉG* 49 (1936), 586-595; now also in his *Études d'histoire et de philologie*, Paris (Vrin) 1975, 141-150). I print the text (again, corrected by Bouffartigue and Patillon) because it is in Schwyzer's edition as well, but I add no footnotes since a) it is not a fragment of Chaeremon and b) comments can easily be found in Festugière's article.

Fragm. 23D

1 Schwyzer 86 argues that it is certain that Jerome had a personal knowledge of Chaeremon's writing(s) on Egypt, for, although he is epitomizing Porphyry's *De Abstinentia* IV 6-8 in *Adversus Iovinianum* II 13 (see fr. 11), he shows there by adding a detail (one which is not in Porphyry) in the form of a literal quotation from Chaeremon (see n. 2 to fr. 11) that he had also read Chaeremon himself. This makes it probable, or at least possible, that other data about Egypt in *Adv. Iov.* go back to Chaeremon as well (also our fr. 24D). Moreover there are some parallels in these passages to other fragments of Chaeremon (see the notes). On Jerome's "plundering" of Porphyry's *De Abst.* in *Adv. Iov.* see H. Hagendahl, *The Latin Fathers and the Classics*, Göteborgs Universitets Årsskrift 64,2, Göteborg 1958, 147-150, and I. Opelt, *Hieronymus' Streitschriften*, Heidelberg (Winter) 1973, 55ff.

For unclear reasons Bickel attributes to Chaeremon II 7 p. 401,10, a line where it is said that for the inhabitants of Pontus and Phrygia it is a delicacy to eat wood-eating worms. I omit it, although Schwyzer adopted it.

2 See *Adv. Iov.* II 13 (our fr. 11), where Chaeremon says that the priests abstain from milk because it is blood with a different colour.

3 Cf. Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* XIX 32, 101 and Juvenal, *Satura* XV 9; also J.G. Griffiths, Religio Pelusiaca, *LdÄ* (forthcoming). *

4 Cf. fr. 21D.

Fragm. 24D

1 On the preparation of this famous Egyptian mixture see Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 569, and Hani, *La religion égyptienne* 285-288. The Suda s.v. Μανέθως mentions a work by Manetho called Περὶ κατασκευῆς κυφίων, 'On the preparation of kyphi'.

Fragm. 25D

1 Schwyzer 86-91 argues on the basis of several agreements between this (probably fourth or fifth century C.E.) compilation of explanations of hieroglyphs and fragments of Chaeremon (esp. fr. 12, but also 19D and 21D) that some of these explanations derive from Chaeremon's *Hieroglyphica*. This has some probability, although it should be borne in mind that there were other writers on hieroglyphs in antiquity and that we are certainly not allowed to derive all later speculations on hieroglyphs from our author (cf., e.g., several passages in Plutarch and Aelian).

It is not clear why Schwyzer adopts only *Hieroglyphica* I 10, I 11, I 19, I 25, and I 36, whereas on the basis of similar agreements I 3, I 6, I 7, I 18, I 44, I 62, and II 21 could be adopted as well. Thus my selection is wider, but it should be stressed that there is no proof whatsoever that these passages do derive from Chaeremon. For comments, the reader is referred to the notes to fr. 12 (except in some cases), and further, to the excellent commentary in Sbordone's edition and to the notes added to their translation by B. van de Walle and J. Vergote, Traduction des Hieroglyphica d'Horapollon, *Chronique d'Égypte* 35 (1943), 39-89 (see also the supplementary notes *ibid.* 44 (1947), 251-259). The latter is a good translation, whereas the one by G. Boas (*The Hieroglyphics of Horapollo*, Bollingen Series XXIII, New York (Pantheon) 1950) is very unreliable. For a general evaluation of Horapollo's interpretations see E. Iverson, *The Myth of Egypt and its Hieroglyphs* 44ff. As do the other Greeks, Horapollo, impeded by ignorance of the true relationship between word and sign, endows the hieroglyphs with symbolic and allegorical qualities.

2 See fr. 12, nr. 17 (n. 25).

3 See fr. 12, nr. 9 (n. 16).

4 Horus in the shape of a falcon is one of the forms of the sun-god.

5 See fr. 12, nr. 8 (n. 15). Extensive comments by Van de Walle and Vergote, *Chronique d'Égypte* 35 (1943), 45ff.

6 Schwyzer's emendation ἔτι δὲ καί is to be preferred to ἔτι τε καὶ (mss.).

7 Similar accounts of the beetle are found in several other classical authors, e.g. Porphyry, *De Abstinentia* IV 9 (our fr. 21D); Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 74, 381A; Aelian, *De Natura Animalium* X 15; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* V 4, 21, 2-3. See the extensive discussions by Sbordone 19-23; Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 407ff.; Griffiths, *Plutarch's DIO* 555f.; Stricker, *OMRO* 57 (1976), 299f. n. 1725; also Bonnet, Skarabäus, *Reallexikon* 720-2.

8 H. Herter, Zu der neuen Ausgabe der Hieroglyphika Horapollons, *Kleine Schriften*, München (Wilhelm Fink) 1975, 529, proposes to read τὰ πρὸς βρῶσιν αὐτῇ χρήσιμα instead of τὰ πρὸς χρῆσιν αὐτῇ βρώσιμα in view of τὰ ... πρὸς βρῶσιν ... χρήσιμα some lines above. This is an attractive emendation.

9 The mss.' ἐπὶ πυκτίδα (picture, parchment codex) does not make any sense. Schwyzer (letter of August 13, 1980) suggests ἐπὶ πυκτείου, 'boxing ring' or 'boxing party'. But it remains uncertain.

10 Egyptian queens and goddesses wear the so-called vulture-headdress.

11 Again, there are several more or less similar accounts of the vulture in ancient literature (quite apart from the interpretation of the hieroglyph), e.g. Chaeremon (?), fr. 26D, below; Aelian, *Nat. anim.* II 46; Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanae* 93, 286C; Ammianus Marcellinus XVII 4, 11 (fr. 28D, below); see the discussion by Sbordone 26-33 (with a wealth of material and literature!); Hani, *La relig. égypt.* 422f.; O. Keller, Geier, *RE* VII (1912), 931-935; Stricker, *OMRO* 57 (1976), 299f. n. 1725; W. Speyer, Geier, *RAC* IX (1976), 430-468, esp. 432-6; E. Brunner-Traut, Geier, *LdÄ* II (1977), 513-515.

12 Cf. fr. 12, nr. 14 (n. 22).

13 Cf. Plutarch, *Quaestiones conviviales* IV 5, 2, 670C. On lion-shaped custodians of temples see Sbordone 52f.; Van de Walle and Vergote, *Chronique d'Égypte* 35 (1943), 59.

14 Cf. fr. 12, nr. 7 (n. 14), where, however, the frog means ἀναβίωσις, return to life. Vergote, *Chronique d'Égypte* 35 (1943), 65, says that if Horapollo replaced Chaeremon's ἀναβίωσις by the Gnostic or Hermetic concept of metempsychosis, the expression ἄπλαστος ἄνθρωπος is easy to explain. This is not very clear, and Sbordone simply says that Chaeremon is right and Horapollo wrong (which would imply that this passage may not derive from Chaeremon). Aelian, *Nat. anim.* II 46, speaks about Egyptian mice as half-formed beings in their first stage. See further Bonnet, Frosch, *Reallexikon* 198f.; M. Weber, Frosch, *RAC* 8 (1972), 524-538 (with many references); J. Leclant, La grenouille d'éternité des pays du Nil au monde méditerranéen, in *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren* II, Leiden (Brill) 1978, 561-572 (lit. in n. 10 on p. 563); see also note 14 to fr. 12, above. It is noteworthy that also in the Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin* 91a, a kind of mouse (?) is discussed which develops from the earth and initially is partly flesh and partly clay; see also the Mishna, *Chullin* IX 6, where the same theme occurs.

15 Ibis for 'heart' is a Ptolemaic sign; see Vergote in *Chronique d'Égypte* 35 (1943), 69. For the likeness of the ibis to the heart see also Aelian, *Nat. anim.* X 29. Discussions in Sbordone 81-83; Vergote, *ibid.* 69; Hani, *Relig. égypt.* 400ff.
16 *Varia lectio* μῖσος, 'hatred'.
17 For fish meaning 'abomination' see Gardiner's Sign-list K2 (cf. n. 7 to fr. 12). See further n. 27 to fr. 10 for lit.
18 See fr. 12, nr. 11 (n. 19).
19 See fr. 12, nr. 16 (n. 24).

Fragm. 26D

1 On the strength of the agreements with Horapollo I 11 (our fr. 25D *sub* e, *dubium*) and since fr. 12 nr. 10 proves that Chaeremon wrote about the vulture, Schwyzer 92f. argues that this fragment from Tzetzes' *Chiliades* most probably derives from Chaeremon. This is questionable, however, since fr. 12 only proves that Chaeremon wrote about the vulture-formed hieroglyph. Moreover, the fact that Tzetzes' account of the vulture's way of life has several parallels in other classical authors makes it very uncertain that his data go back to Chaeremon. So I would suggest that it is much less certain than Schwyzer admits that our author's writings are Tzetzes' source here. For parallels and literature the reader is referred to fr. 25D n. 11.
2 Leone reads δι᾽ ἅ here, but I prefer οἷά, a conjecture in the old edition of Kiessling (1826).

Fragm. 27D

1 C. Wendel, Zum Hieroglyphenbuche Chairemons, *Hermes* 75 (1940), 228 claims this fragment to be derived from Chaeremon's *Hieroglyphica*. This may well be right, since in fr. 12 Tzetzes explicitly mentions Chaeremon as the source of his explanations of hieroglyphs. This fragment is not in Schwyzer's edition.
2 This might be Gardiner's D46 (see note 7 to fr. 12). Tzetzes repeats this explanation at other places of his exegesis of the Iliad; see A. Lolos, *Der unbekannte Teil der Ilias-Exegesis des Iohannes Tzetzes*, Königstein (Hain) 1981, 45: χεὶρ γὰρ ἡ πρακτικὴ ἐνέργεια κατὰ τὰ συμβολικὰ γράμματα τῶν Αἰθιόπων λέγεται. And *ibid.* 101: χεὶρ ὡς πρῶτον ἐδίδαξα ἡ πρακτικὴ ἐνέργεια· καὶ τὰ Αἰθιόπεια γράμματα συμβολικῶς λέγεται.

Fragm. 28D

1 Schwyzer 98 says that it cannot be excluded that the following two passages from Ammianus Marcellinus (second half of the fourth century C.E.) derive from Chaeremon, since the first passage is reminiscent of fragm. 12, the second one of fragm. 2. Nevertheless, he does not print them as *Fragmenta dubia*.
2 For this translation of *natura* see H. Herter, Genitalien, *RAC* X (1978), 3 and B.H. Stricker, *De geboorte van Horus* III, Leiden (Ex Oriente Lux) 1975, 299 n. 1774. Cf. the use of φύσις in fragm. 25D *sub* e (Horapollo I 11).
3 See fragm. 12 nos. 10 and 11. I adopt the reading 'his signis' instead of the conjecture 'his rerum insignibus'.
4 Cf. Aelian, *Nat. anim.* VI 43; Pausanias I 42, 3; W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae* II, Hildesheim (Olms) 1960 (repr. of the ed. of 1905), 432 (nr. 694).
5 Mss. have *innumeras multas*; Rolfe adopts the conjecture *innumeras illas*. But *multas* should be athetized.
6 In this fragm. there are some vague reminiscences of fragm. 2.

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

The references are to pages; the bracketed references are to fragments, testimonia or notes.

ablutions, ritual 21(10), 60(45)
abstinence from
  bread 19(10)
  eggs 23(11)
  fish 19(10)
  meat 19(10), 21(10), 23(11), 37(22D), 58(21)
  milk 23(11)
  oil 19(10)
  pulse 21(10)
  sex 21(10)
  vegetables 21(10)
  wine 19(10), 23(11), 58(21)
Abydos 13(4), 54(4)
alcohol 58(22;23)
allegory, allegorical method 5(9), 7(12), 25 (12), 58(15), 62(1), 72(1)
alphabetic use of hieroglyphs 69(3)
Amenhotep, son of Hapu 50(5), 67(21)
Amenophis, king 9(1), 49(3), 50(4)
Amphiaraus 13(2)
Amun(-Re) 65(2;3;4;6), 68(18D:6)
Anabis 31(17D), 35(21D), 67(21)
anch-sign 65(3)
animal-worship 37(21D;23D)
anti-Semitic authors 49(1), 50(4).
Anubis 52(11), 69(12)
apes 59(35)
Apis 33(17D), 52(11), 67(23;25)
Apollinopolis (Edfu) 31(17D), 66(17)
arithmetics 21(10)
ascetic life 56(10:1), 58(21)
astrological terminology 55(3)
astrology 11(2), 15(5), 17(8), 17(9), 23(10), 51(1), 52(5), 55(12), 56(8:2)
Athribis 67(21)
augury 5(11), 48(2)

Babylonians (see also Chaldaeans) 51(1), 52(6)
bais, *baiae* 21(10), 23(11), 60(46)
bas-reliefs 35(20D), 70(20D:6)
bee 43(25D), 45(28D)
beetle (see also scarab) 11(2), 25(12), 35 (20D), 37(21D), 39(25D), 70(21D:1)
beetle-mark 33(17D), 67(25)
Berossus 51(2), 64(16:1;2)
Bes 52(11)
bow 25(12)
bull 31(17D), 33(19D), 67(23;24;25)
bumble-bee 11(2)
calf-sealers 21(10), 59(37;38)

Canopus 61(55)
Chaldaeans 9(2), 11(2), 56(8:2)
chastity 11(2), 53(12)
chaste-tree 11(2), 53(12)
child 25(12), 33(19D)
Chnum 66(15)
cista mystica 52(8), 58(19)
cockchafer 11(2)
Comasiae 33(19D), 69(11)
comets 13(3), 53(3:2)
conjunctions 25(14)
contemplation 17(10), 23(11)
cow-worship 59(32)
crocodile 29(17D), 33(19D), 37(21D), 65(7), 67(17), 68(19D:7)

date-palm 39(25D)
decani 15(5), 17(9), 55(5)
deer 25(12), 43(25D)
deification 67(21)
Demeter 11(2), 29(17D), 66(10)
demiurge 15(5)
demotic 69(2)
determinatives 70(20D:5)
Dionysus 29(17D), 52(11)
Diospolis 33(19D), 68(19D:3)
dogs 33(19D), 69(12)

ear-stelae 69(9)
earth, celestial and terrestrial 29(17D), 66 (9)
eel 11(2)
egg 23(11), 29(17D), 65(5)
Egypt, land of 31(17D)
Egytian scripts 34(20D), 69(1)
Egyptian wisdom x, xiii(16), 11(2), 52(9)
Eileithyiaspolis (El Kab) 31(17D), 67(18)
Elephantine 31(17D), 66(15)
Eleusis 31(17D)
endurance 17(10)
enkrateia 57(9)
epistolographic script 69(2)

Ethiopic characters 3(6), 25(12), 62(3), 73 (27D:2)
etymological wordplay 57(8), 66(9)
exodus 5(8), 49(1)
expletive conjunctions 25(14), 64(14:1)

falcon 25(12), 31(17D), 33(19D), 37(21D), 39(25D), 63(15;16), 67(17), 70(21D:1;5; 6), 72(4)
fasting 17(10), 21(10), 57(10)
fish 33(19D), 43(25D), 59(27), 68(19D:6), 73(17)
fly 11(2)
frog 25(12), 43(25D), 63(14), 72(14)
frugality 17(10), 58(21)

geometrics 21(10)
goat 31(17D)
goat and ram, confusion of 66(15)

hagneia, meaning of 57(10)
half moon 33(17D)
hand 19(10), 45(27D), 58(19), 73(27D:2)
Hapy 66(12)
Heimarmene 15(5)
Heliopolis 31(17D), 67(24)
Helios 13(4)
Hephaestus 29(17D)
Hermes 31(17D), 43(25D)
Hermetic writings 17(9), 55(8), 71(22D:1)
hieratic script 69(2)
hieroglyphs 25(12), 39(25D), 41(25D), 43 (25D), 62(1), 69(2), 71(25D:1)
hierogrammateus (sacred scribe) x, 9(1), 23 (10), 25(12), 50(7), 61(58)
hierostolistes (priest in charge of the sacred vestments) 61(57)
hippopotamus 31(17D), 67(17), 68(19D:7)
homosexuality 60(44)
Horapollo 62(1)
horologos 61(59)
horoscope 15(5), 17(9), 55(6)
horse 33(19D)
Horus 31(17D), 33(18D), 50(4), 54(7), 65 (7), 66(17), 68(18D:2), 72(4)
Horus of Edfu 67(17)
Hyksos 49(1), 50(10)
hymns to the gods 21(10)
hyssop 19(10), 23(11), 59(25)

Iacchus 11(2), 52(11)
ibis 27(15D),. 33(19D), 37(21D), 43(25D), 69(12), 73(15)
idealization (of the way of life of the Egyptian priests) 56(10:1)
ideograms 70(20D:5;6)
Imhotep 67(21)
impregnation by the wind 41(25D), 43(26D)
Isis 13(4), 15(5), 29(17D), 50(4), 66(9;10; 11), 70 (21D:5)

Jews 9(1), 50(13)
Joannes (Oannes) 11(2), 27(16D), 52(6), 64 (16D:2)
Joseph 9(1), 50(7;8)
justice 17(10)

Khepri 67(25), 71(7)
Khons 53(4:2)
Kneph 29(17D), 65(2;5)
Kore 29(17D), 66(10)
kyphi 39(24D), 71(24D:1)

laughing 19(10)
lion 25(12), 33(19D), 35(21D), 63(22;23)
lion, front part of a 43(25D)
lion, head of a 43(25D)
lion-worship 70(2)
lotus-flower 15(4), 54(7)

magic 52(9), 53(4:2; 3)
magnet 11(2)
man (as symbol) 33(19D)
man holding his chin 25(12)
Manetho 9(1), 49(2), 65(4)
man-worship 31(17D), 35(21D), 70(1)
mathematici 56(8:2)
Memphis 67(25)
milk 23(11), 29(17D)
Min 52(11), 68(18D:2;4;5;6)
Mnevis 31(17D), 67(24;25)
monks 36(10:1)
moon 15(5), 29(17D), 31(17D), 39(25D), 66(9), 67(18;19)
moschosphragistica 59(38)
Moses 5(8), 9(1), 50(7;8)
mouse 72(14)

natura (physis) for 'genitals' 73(28D:2)
Nefertem 54(7)
Nekhbet 67(18)
Nephthys 70(21D:5)
Nero 3(3;4)
Nile (see also river) 29(17D), 66(12)
Ninos 11(2), 52(6)
nome
  Leontopolite 35(21D), 39(23D)
  Bousirite 35(21D), 39(23D)
  Cynopolite 35(21D), 39(23D)
  Lycopolite 35(21D), 39(23D)

Nubia 62(3)
Nun 65(5), 66(12)

Oannes, see Joannes
old man 24(12), 33(19D)
onions 11(2)
oracle 13(2), 61(56)
Orphism 65(6)
Osarseph 50(8)
Osiris 13(4), 15(5), 29(17D), 50(8), 52(8), 52(11), 54(4), 65(7), 66(10; 11)

palm-tree 21(10)
Pan 68(18D:5)
paranatellontes 15(5), 55(4)
particles (gramm.) 64(14:1)
passions 17(10)
pastophoros 23(10), 61(60)
patronymic 25(14), 64(14:2)
Pelusium 9(1), 37(23D)
Peteseph 9(1), 50(8)
Philopohus 27(14), 64(5)
philosophia, ethical and religious sense of 57(2)
phoenix 25(13), 63(1)
Phritibautes 9(1), 50(5)
physikos logos, mening of 58(15)
pictographic use of hieroglyphs 69(4)
planets 11(2), 15(5;6), 17(9)
Priapus 11(2), 33(18D), 52(11), 68(18D:2; 5)
priests, Egyptian 17, 19, 21, 23(10), 56 (10:1)
processions 19(10), 69(11)
prophets 23(10), 61(56)
Ptah 29(17D), 65(5;6)
Ptolemaic sign-system 62(1;7)
purification 17(10), 21(10), 57(10)
purity 57(6)
pylon 68(19D:3)

Qumran 60(53)

ram 31(17D), 37(21D)
ram and goat, confusion of 66(15)
Ramesses 9(1), 49(3)
ranks of priests 60(55)
Re 53(4:2), 54(7)
restraint 17(10)
river, the (= the Nile) 15(5), 55(10)
Rosetta 61(55)

Salmeschiniaca 15(5), 17(9), 55(8)
Saqqara 67(21)
Sarapis 11(2), 52(11)
Satyr 11(2), 52(11)
scarab (see also beetle) 53(13), 70(20D:6; 7;8), 71(7)
sceptre 33(18D)
scribe, sacred, see *hierogrammateus*
scripts, Egyptian 35(20D)
  allegorical 35(20D), 70(7)
  epistolographic 35(20D), 69(2)
  hieratic 35(20D), 69(2)
  hieroglyphic 35(20D) et passim
  literal 35(20D), 69(3)
  metaphorical 35(20D), 70(6)
  symbolic 35(20D), 69(4)
Selene 13(4)
self-control 17(10)
Sepa 50(8)
Seth (see also Typhon) 50(4), 65(7), 67(17)
sexual desires 23(11), 33(17D), 58(23)
Silenus 11(2), 52(11)
snake 25(12)
solar bark 13(4), 29(17D), 33(19D), 54(5; 7), 65(7)
sphinx 27(15D), 33(19D), 52(8)
squill 11(2)
stars 11(2), 13(2), 15(5;6), 17(9), 23(11), 29(17D)
statues of the gods 19(10), 33(19D)
Stoic explanation of myths IX, X, 54(2), 55 (11)
stolistes 23(10)
sun and sun-god 13(2), 15(5), 29(17D), 31 (17D), 33(18D;19D), 37(21D), 54(7), 68 (18D:6), 71(7)
symbol, symbolic interpretation 11(2), 25 (12), 29(17D), 31(17D), 33(19D), 43(25D), 45(27D), 68(19D:1), 72(1)
sympatheia (magic) 13(2), 53(15)

temples 17(10), 57(2;6)
Therapeutae 56(10:1)
Thoth 53(4:2), 69(12)
threatening the gods 13(4), 53(4:2)
Tisithen 9(1), 50(8)
Typhon (see also Seth) 13(4), 31(17D), 66 (17)

vegetarianism 59(29)
vision of the divine 17(10), 57(8)
votive offerings representing parts of the human body 69(9)
vulture 11(2), 25(12), 31(17D), 37(21D), 39 (25D), 43(26D), 45(28D), 67(19), 72(11), 73(26D:1)
vulture-heddress 72(10)

weeping eye 25(12)
wisdom, Egyptian xiii(16), 9(2), 11(2), 52 (9)
withdrawal from the world 58(14)
woman beating a drum 25(12)
zodiac 15(4;5), 17(9), 55(4;5;6)

INDEX OF ANCIENT AUTHORS AND WORKS

Aelian
De natura animalium II 42 70(21D:5)
II 46 72(11;14)
VI 43 73(28D:4)
X 15 72(7)
X 29 73(15)
XI 39 71(21D:6)
Aetius
Placita II 32, 5 64(13:1)
Apuleius
Metamorphoses XI 23 60(45)
Augustinus
De civitate dei X 11 54(9)
Aulus Gellius
Noctes Atticae I 9, 6 56(8:2)

Berossus fragm. 1 52(6), 64 (16D:1)
Bible
Genesis 41 50(7)
Genesis 41:45 LXX 50(8)
Daniel 10:3 59(30)
Acts 7:22 XIII(16)

Book of the Dead 125(b 12) 60(44)

Cicero
De divinatione I 19,36 51(1)
II 46,96 51(1)

Clemens Alexandrinus
Stromateis V 4,19,3 57(5)
V 4,21,2-3 72(7)
V 7,41,2 65(7)
V 7,42,3 63(21)
VI 4,35-37 69(11)
VI 4,35,3-4 60(55)
VI 4,36,2 59(38)

Diodorus Siculus
Bibliotheca I 9 51(1)
I 13 67(21)
I 16 51(1)
I 69 51(1)
I 81 51(1)
I 89 59(43)
II 31 51(1)
III 3-4 47(6), 62(3; 4; 6)
Dioscurides
De materia medica I 103 53(12)

Dionysius Thrax
Ars grammatica 20:8 64(14:1)

Eusebius - Rufinus
Historia ecclesiastica XI 23 57(6)

Genesis Apocryphon XIX 12 55(10)
Gnomon of the Idios Logos 71 57(8)

Heliodorus
Aethiopica IV 8,1 62(3)
Herodas
Mimiambe IV 56 61(60)
Herodotus
Historiae II 37 58(22), 59(27; 43), 60(45)
II 38 59(37)
II 41 59(32)
II 64 59(44)
II 112 52(5)
II 121 52(5)
III 28 67(24;25)
Ps.-Hippocrates
De medico I 58(16)
Homer
Iliad III 277 69(9)
Odyssey IV 477 66(12)
Horapollo
Hieroglyphica I 3 60(46)
I 6 63(16)
I 7 63(15)
I 10 63(20)
I 11 73(26D:1)
I 19 63(22)
I 20 66(12)
I 44 59(27), 68 (19D:6)
I 62 63(19)

Iamblichus
De mysteriis IX 4 55(12)
De vita Pythagorica 96 57(3)
98 59(27)
Isocrates
Busiris 21 60(53)
23 60(52)

Jerome
Adversus Iovinianm II 13 59(31)

Josephus
Antiquitates Judaicae I 168 51(1)
Contra Apionem I 73-91 49(2)
I 93-105 49(2)
I 228-252 49(2)
I 237-239 50(10)
I 246-247 50(11)
I 293-303 51(15)
Juvenal
Saturae II 1-65 47(10)
XV 9 71(3)

Lucian
Dialogus deorum 7 66(11)

Macrobius
Saturnalia
I 19,13 63(21)
I 20,16-17 65(6)
Minucius Felix
Octavius 29 67(21)
Mishna
Chullin IX 6 72(14)

Oracle of the Potter 50(4)

Pap. Oxyr. 840,8 58(13)
Pausanias
Descriptio Graeciae I 42,3 73(4)
Philo Alexandrinus
De vita contemplativa 24 58(14)
26 60(51)
28 57(2)
29 60(51)
30 57(11), 58(19)
31 58(17)
37 58(21; 22; 24)
39 58(15)
73 58(21), 59(29; 42)
74 58(22)
Philostratus
Vita Apollonii I 4 57(3)
I 8 57(3)
Plinius
Naturalis Historia VII 56,192 51(1)
XIX 32,101 71(3)
Plutarch
An seni resp. ger. sit 18, 793B 60(49)
Quaestiones Romanae 93, 286C 72(11)
Quaestiones conviv. IV 5,2, 670C 72(13)
De Iside et Osiride
2,351E 66(9)
2,351F-352A 57(9)
5,352F 59(43)
6,353A-B 58(22)
6,353B 57(10)
7,353C-D 59(27)
9,354D 65(4)
18,357F-358A 54(6)
21,359A 65(2)
27,361E 66(10)
28,362B 66(10)
31,363B 59(36; 37)
32,363D 66(11)
32,363F 63(16), 68(7; 8)
33,364B-C 67(24)
34,364D 66(10)
37,365E 66(10)
39,366E 63(21)
40,367C 55(11)
41,367E 55(11)
45,369A 55(11)
50,371C 67(17)
51,371F 70(21D: 5)
55,373E 67(17)
60,375C 66(9)
66,377C-E 66(10)
74,381A 53(13)
75,381D 69(12)
77,382C-D 58(15)
Porphyry
De abstinentia I 36 57(3)
IV 9 72(7)
IV 12 58(21), 60(45)
Vita Pythagorae 12 69(2)
Procopius
De bellis 19: 35 68(18D: 2)

Seneca
Naturales Quaestiones
VII 5,3 53(3: 2)
VII 17,2 53(3: 2)
VII 21,3 53(3: 2)
Sextus Empiricus
Adversus mathematicos V 1-2 56(8: 2)
Strabo
Geographia XVII 42 54(4)

Suetonius
Vita Neronis 36 55(3: 2)

Tacitus
Annales VI 28 63(13: 1)
XIV 22 53(3: 2)
Talmud Babyl.
Sanhedrin 91a 72(14)
Testamentum Judae 14-16 58(23)

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA to the first edition

p. IX, ll. 6-7: A. Barzanò, Cheremone di Alessandria, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II 32, 3, Berlin-New York 1985, p. 1987 assumes that Chaeremon got this function together with Seneca in 49 C.E. That may be true, but the sources do not permit us any certainty on this point.

p. IX, ll. 21-23: This is impossible, of course, for chronological reasons. Hence P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* II, Oxford 1972, 1107 n. 46 suggests that our Chaeremon may have been the grandson of the Chaeremon who accompanied Aelius Gallus on a trip in Egypt.

p. IX, l. 33 – p. X, l. 4: Barzanò, *op. cit.* 1998-2000, denies that Chaeremon was a Stoic and emphasizes that as a priest he was a religious dignitary, not a philosopher. Barzanò assumes that the ancient view that Chaeremon was a Stoic philosopher (Martial, *Ep.* XI, 56, 1; Apollonius Dyscolus, *De coni.* 6; Origen, *C. Cels.* I 59; Porphyry, *De abst.* IV 6) was based upon a misunderstanding of his religious message. That is not very probable. Quite apart from the fact that in this period there was no strict distinction between religion and philosophy (certainly not in Stoic circles), fragments 5 and 12 clearly reveal Stoic ideas and terminology. For other representatives of the Egyptian clergy teaching philosophy or grammar in Alexandria see G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes. A historical approach to the late pagan mind*, Cambridge 1986, 167 n. 44.

p. X, ll. 5-14: J. Bingen doubts whether Chaeremon really was a *hierogrammateus*. "Le titre d'hiérogrammate n'est-il pas simplement une amplification érudite postérieure née du fait que le philosophe avait écrit une *Histoire d'Égypte* et un *Traité sur les hiéroglyphes* et l'avait fait avec une connaissance certaine de l'un et l'autre sujets?" (review in *Chronique d'Égypte* 59, no. 117 (1984), 191). One cannot completely rule out the possibility that Porphyry and Tzetzes (the only ones to call Chaeremon a *hierogrammateus*) assumed that he must have been one because he knew the secrets of the hieroglyphic script which were handed down only in priestly circles. On the other hand, there are several elements that seem to plead in favour of Porphyry's and Tzetzes' statement. First, however mistaken the allegorical element in his interpretation of several hieroglyphs may be, there is undoubtedly a hard core of real knowledge of this script in fragment 12; and if Clement's description of the

three types of Egyptian writing (fragment 20D) goes back to Chaeremon, which is very probable, this enhances the impression that his knowledge of those matters was so intimate that he must have belonged to the priestly circles in which this knowledge of the scripts (however deteriorating) was cultivated. Second, since other writers on the history of Egypt or on hieroglyphs (e.g. Manetho and Horapollo) are never called *hierogrammateis*, we have little reason to assume that in the case of Chaeremon Porphyry and Tzetzes did so without basis, i.e. without reliable tradition. Third, as Barzanò (*op. cit.* 1995) remarks, there are some conspicuous parallels between Martial's description of Chaeremon (Test. 10) and Chaeremon's own description of the Egyptian priests (fragm. 10), which favours the theory that he was a priest himself.

p. XIX: the only important publication on Chaeremon after 1983 was Barzanò's above-mentioned study in *ANRW* II 32, 3 (1985), 1981-2001, which is a valuable survey of research (although it was apparently written before my book was published), but it has some rather speculative elements, e.g. when B. sees traces of Chaeremon's influence in Nero's personality and behaviour (1988-90).

p. 9, fragm. 1, l. 17: read "Jews[13], ..."

p. 11, fragm. 2, ll. 1-12: This whole passage is strikingly reminiscent of early Jewish traditions about the way in which the astrological knowledge of the antediluvian giants (cf. Gen. 6:1-4) had been preserved in spite of the great flood. For references (e.g. *Jubilees* 8:2-4; Josephus, *Ant.* I 70-71) see M. Küchler, *Schweigen, Schmuck und Schleier*, Freiburg-Göttingen 1986, 432-435 with nn. 64-66. Rather than assuming that Chaeremon knew these Jewish speculations, I think it is probable that Jews adopted and modified for their own purposes motifs from the Hellenistic debate about the origin of astrology.

p. 11, fragm. 2, l. 6: "calculations", perhaps better "reports".

p. 13, fragm. 2, ll. 6-7: This remark is curious and has no parallels. On Amphiaraus' well-known oracle see W. Fauth in *Der Kleine Pauly* I (1964), 308-310.

p. 15, fragm. 5, l. 7: 'their treatments of diseases' refers to books on astrological medicine ('iatromathematics') on which see A.-J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* I, Paris 1950[2], 137-186, and E. Boer in *Der Kleine Pauly* II (1967), 1326-7.

p. 17, fragm. 10, l. 2: for passages in other authors in which Egyptian priests are presented as philosophers see Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes* 14-15 nn.

p. 17, fragm. 10, l. 9 with n. 5: J. Gwyn Griffiths rightly remarks in his review: "The 'almost' here includes, in Ptolemaic and Roman times, the open forecourt beyond the pylons to which general access was allowed. Van der Horst does not remark on this. He quotes a similar statement from Clement of Alexandria, but this refers to the sanctuaries (*adyta*), and entry to these inner parts of temples was indeed a priestly prerogative" (*Class. Rev.* 35, 1985, 311).

p. 29, fragm. 17D, ll. 27-28: "power", perhaps better "force", since 'force', like *dynamis*, can mean both 'power' and 'meaning'.

p. 33, fragm. 19D, ll. 8-9: Read "Further (there is represented) a falcon as the symbol of god, a fish as that of hatred, etc."

p. 35, fragm. 21D, l. 8 from bottom: Of course this etymology of 'Bousiris' is wrong; it has nothing to do with *bous*, but it means 'house of Osiris'; see Bonnet, *Reallexikon* 129.

p. 39, fragm. 25D, ll. 4-5: Cf. Aelian, *Nat. anim.* X 14.

p. 41, fragm. 25D, ll. 13-19: Cf. M. David-B. A. van Groningen, *Papyrological Primer*, Leiden 1965⁴, 35⁺: "the Egyptians reckoned of old by a solar year of 365 days divided into 12 months of 30 days and 5 intercalary days (called by the Greeks *epagomenai*) which were inserted at the end of the year".

p. 47, test. 4 n. 1: Like Chaeremon in 40, this student of his, too, was the leader of an anti-Jewish embassy to Rome under Trajan. See Pap. Oxy. X 1242 and H. G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain*, 4 vols, Paris 1960-1961, I, 111-112.

p. 47, test. 4 n. 3: See now esp. Barzanò, *op. cit.* 1986f.

p. 47, test. 5 n. 1: "The other names are hardly identifiable", except, of course, Barbillus who is the well-known astrologer Balbillus, on which see e.g. Pflaum, *op. cit.* I, 34-41.

p. 47, test. 10 n. 1: For a new translation of Martial's *Ep.* XI 56 see now N. M. Kay, *Martial Book XI: a commentary*, London 1985, 190 with the excellent and detailed commentary on pp. 191-195. Kay doubts whether Martial had our Chaeremon in mind. "M. is using the name as a label rather than making a point about an individual" (192), for which Kay compares *Ep.* XI 60, 6 and

XI 84, 5. But he cannot deny that "M. also intends it as a recognisable Stoic appellation" (*ibid.*).

p. 49, fragm. 1 n. 1: See now esp. C. Aziza, L'utilisation polémique du récit de l'Exode chez les écrivains alexandrins (IVème siècle av. J.-C.-Ier siècle ap. J.-C.), *ANRW* II 20, 1, Berlin-New York 1987, 41-65 (on Chaeremon 60f.).

p. 53, fragm. 2 n. 12 end: See now R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, Harmondsworth 1986, 355.

p. 53, fragm. 2 n. 15: On the Hermetic understanding of cosmic sympathy, which is at the background here, see Fowden, *op. cit.* 75-78.

p. 55, fragm. 5 n. 8: On Chaeremon's familiarity with Hermetic astrology see Fowden, *op. cit.* 139f.

p. 55, fragm. 5 n. 10: Reference could have been made to earlier instances like e.g. Gen. 41:1 and Exod. 1:22 (both in the Hebrew text and in the LXX); and see for Egyptian instances Erman-Grapow, *Wörterbuch* I 146.

p. 56, fragm. 10 n. 1: An English translation of parts of this fragment now also in Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes* 54-55. J. Gwyn Griffiths tempers my scepticism as to the historical reliability of Chaeremon's account by the remark, "A general question that rises here is whether broad conformity to a genre necessarily implies complete devaluation of historicity. In this case the greater part of Van der Horst's Commentary confirms the origin of Chaeremon's details in Egyptian practice" (*Class. Rev.* 35, 1985, 311).

p. 58, fragm. 10 nn. 18+21: Add to the references to Bremmer's articles now his "Symbolen van marginaliteit bij de vroeg-christelijke heiligen", in A. Hilhorst (ed.), *De heiligenverering in de eerste eeuwen van het christendom*, Nijmegen 1987 (forthcoming).

p. 58, fragm. 10 n. 19: On keeping the hands inside the robe as a sign of *sōphrosynē*, see B. Fehr, *Bewegungsweisen und Verhaltensideale*, Bad Bramstedt 1979, 18 and 94 n. 102.

p. 58, fragm. 10 n. 20: Cf. also Clemens Alex., *Strom.* VI 4, 35f.

p. 63, fragm. 12 n. 21: A bull as a symbol of the earth (not as a hieroglyph) may perhaps be attested in some Egyptian sources. See E. Hornung, *Das Buch von den Pforten des Jenseits* II, Geneva 1984, 84-89, and his remarks in his

"Auf den Spuren der Sonne: Gang durch ein ägyptisches Königsgrab", *Eranos Yearbook* 50 (1981), 462 (431-475).

p. 67, fragm. 17D n. 17 end: Cf. H. Frankfort, *The Cenotaph of Seti I at Abydos* II, London 1933, Plate LXXXIV, col. 4, where the goddess of heaven, Nut, is represented as a sow devouring its own children, but this sow was later interpreted as a hippopotamus; see e.g. H. Schlögel, Reret, *LdÄ* V (1985), 243-244, esp. n. 2.

p. 67, fragm. 17D n. 21 end: and cf. Corp. Herm., *Ascl.* 37.

p. 71, fragm. 23D n. 3: Add Lucian, *Jupiter trag.* 42.

(For some of the above addenda I owe thanks to my colleagues J. Bremmer, G. Mussies and H. Stadhouders)